

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

APRIL 1946

ALFRED EDWARD TAYLOR

PHILOSOPHY in these days lies somewhat under a cloud. This is only to be expected, considering the strain and confusion of the last six years of war. If it is true that *inter arma leges silent*, there is certainly no chance for the academic conversations of the garden or the porch. But the confusion goes farther back. The shaking of the nations which made us tremble in 1914 (and how much more we should have trembled if we had known what was in store for us!) has never ceased. Fear, hope, and despair have swept over the world again and again; and the human intellect has been seduced and betrayed from its proper task of attempting to understand and interpret the nature and the works of man, into devising the subtlest and most terrible means of destroying man and his works from the earth. What Germany set herself to do, openly and unashamedly, even before 1933, other nations have been forced, however reluctantly, to emulate. There are indeed some who have not bowed the knee to Baal. A. N. Whitehead and Bertrand Russell, though in very different ways, have preserved the tradition of those who would be spectators of all time and all existence, as Hegel is said to have completed his *Phenomenology of the Spirit* while the guns of Jena were thundering but a mile or two away. But even today, when construction has to take the place of all the devastation of the past, and everyone is immersed in planning for the future, the exigencies of the time are so pitiless that what we call our long-term plans are little more than hand-to-mouth expedients. For seeing life solemnly and whole we have neither the time nor the spirit.

This, however, is no reason for despair, or for indolence. The war indeed may prove to have rendered some service in the world of thought if it brings to an end the readiness to believe that German verdicts and theories must have some virtue beyond those of our countrymen in the world of æsthetics and philosophy, though the loss would be equally great if it led us to condemn the great German thinkers of the past because of their nationality — the musicians at all events are probably free from such a fate. But we may well remind ourselves that philosophy, and especially the philosophy of religion, has always been more at home in England than in Germany, and that Immanuel Kant, the greatest of German philosophers, whose influence has been discernible in the most serious British philosophy from his day to our own, owed his inspiration, or his stimulus, to our David Hume. Nor need we be ashamed if British philosophy has always shown a tendency to preoccupy itself with religion — sometimes, it must be confessed, in spite of itself. There is reason, as we shall see in a few

moments, why philosophy must always approximate to the philosophy of religion. In this country, both north and south of the Border, the interest in religion has always been so strong that it has itself encouraged, and, we may perhaps add, elevated philosophical studies. Nor have we as yet any ground for supposing that the experiences of the last generation will permanently alter our national bent.

Last year a gathering took place in Oxford to do honour to one whose name will at once occur to all students of the philosophy of religion, Professor C. C. J. Webb. His friends recalled how his formative period was lived in the Oxford of the nineties; but all the teachers under whose influence his own thought was shaped, F. H. Bradley, William Wallace, Cook Wilson, Edward Caird, and Bernard Bosanquet, owed a deep debt to one who had already passed away, but who had made his mark both in the University and the city, Thomas Hill Green; a man who left few avowed disciples; yet, as with Jowett in other fields, his pupils could be recognized everywhere.

A very different note was already being sounded in those now far-off days, in the school of thought known as pragmatism, by F. C. S. Schiller in Oxford and William James in America. Since then, America has sent over to us the daring philosophy, if we may use the term with such a reference, of behaviourism. Behaviourism has satisfied very few leaders of thought in this country; but the general type of philosophy which characterized the Oxford common-rooms in the nineties had its counterpart at Cambridge, in the work of James Ward, McTaggart, Sorley, and Broad. It would not be possible, as all would agree, to talk of these as forming a school; to set them side by side indeed would, on the surface at least, suggest divergencies rather than affinities. But they were all convinced that philosophy is properly a guide to life; and that even if many thinking men, as Green once remarked, have come to turn to poetry rather than philosophy to find that guidance, it is for philosophy to point out the abiding principles on which human life is based, and the no less abiding laws in obedience to which the good life may be attained.

Such has been the motive of all sound philosophy since the days of Plato and Aristotle. This is not to suggest that at bottom it is a kind of pragmatism or utilitarianism, or that its end, as Francis Bacon said of science, is 'the relief of man's estate'. It is rather the cross-examination of life in order to understand its conditions. Man is not the master of his fate. He can no more do what he likes with his spirit than he can with his body. There is a pattern to which he must conform; eternal distinctions between which he must choose; 'laws unwritten and secure,' in Sophocles' great words, of which he must take account. Reality is greater than the individual, with his own desires and preferences. All men are under authority. And although by no means all the upholders of this *philosophia perennis*, as it has been called, would consider these laws, as Sophocles did, to be divine in their origin, yet something akin to that which we call God can be discerned in what the demands they make on mankind involve.

That is why all philosophy approaches to a philosophy of religion. As Webb has expressed it in his Gifford lectures, philosophy could not have arisen, and could not continue long to flourish, except on the soil of religion. This is not because the leading Greek philosophers were essentially religious, as they were, though their master Socrates was condemned as an 'atheist'; nor because most

philosophers in medieval and modern times have grown up within the Christian Church. The connexion is not an accidental one. If religion, in its most comprehensive sense, is a recognition of some divine power which makes demands on us and of whom we have to take account (and most definitions would seem to imply just this), we must all be interested in knowing what we can of the power and its demands, and what is their relation to the world in which we live. And further, if we set out on the cross-examination of life, we shall naturally be interested in its application to our own life and destiny, or it becomes no more than the study of abstract mathematics. We cannot detach ourselves from the world. We begin and end with our experience in it and of it. And if we discover some existence, at once transcendent and immanent, as the *philosophia perennis* is always leading us to do, we must put ourselves into some kind of relation to it. When we do so, we are as near to religion as to philosophy. We must make terms with whatever we know of existence and reality. This is what the great schoolmen were endeavouring to do, however limited their universe of thought. It has been equally the endeavour of the moderns, from Descartes to Spinoza, from Spinoza to Kant and Hegel, as it has been of those whose names I have already mentioned. It even may be that the future will find the best of our contemporary philosophy in the series of Gifford lectures, in which philosophy is understood, in broad and general terms, as the philosophy of religion.

These reflections have been suggested by the loss to both philosophy and religion which has been experienced by the death of Alfred Edward Taylor, the emeritus professor of philosophy at Edinburgh University, who has enriched our philosophical literature by a succession of important works from 1901 up to the publication of his last book — *Does God Exist?* — at the time of his death toward the end of last year. A few years the senior of Webb, he went up to Oxford from Kingswood School with a classical scholarship in 1887, and became known as one of the most brilliant men in his year. A degree in classics at Oxford meant then, as it means still, a close study of the fundamental ideas of Greek life, both in philosophy and politics, based on a careful reading of Plato and Aristotle, and extended (such at least was the ideal) to the whole course of European philosophical and political thought. It was as fitting that a teacher like T. H. Green should lecture on the principles of political obligation as on the presuppositions of ethics.

To one whose first acquaintance with Greek philosophy, as it was expected in those days, came through the *Republic* of Plato, it was natural that Greek philosophy should be thought of as standing for a pattern of life, laid up in some heavenly place, an idea which was strengthened by the further study of Aristotle. But the Oxford of those days did not confine itself to antiquity. Again led by Green, it set itself to demolish (so at least the undergraduate would gather) the specious but widely entertained errors of J. S. Mill and Herbert Spencer, and the whole interpretation of life as the pursuit of happiness: few of us went on at the time to connect the phrase with the American Declaration of Independence. To the empiricism which had been dominant in England in the seventies, Oxford opposed what might be called either idealism or realism: the conviction that what can be known to be real exists for thought rather than feeling (in either sense of that ambiguous term), and that thought is not only of the individual, but constitutes a world or universe in which individual thought finds

its validity and worth. Thus, against Mill and Spencer, the Oxford schools set up Kant and Hegel. Even before Edward Caird came from Glasgow to the Mastership of Balliol, left vacant by Benjamin Jowett, there were few who did not feel they had somehow to come to terms with the Categorical Imperative and the Absolute or Spiritual Principal, essential alike for logic and for history.

Such was the world in which Taylor found himself. He was not one to choose a leader and follow him blindly. His nature was *nullius in verba* magistri. But he came under the spell of one of the most penetrating of Oxford intellectuals. F. H. Bradley had been a fellow of Merton for twenty years when Taylor, after taking his degree, gained a fellowship at the same college, finding also A. S. Peake in the common-room there. Bradley, whose interest in religion was as deep as his reading was wide, spoke in the preface to his *Appearance and Reality* of his loyalty to the ideal of 'scepticism, the attempt to become aware of and to doubt all presuppositions'. Taylor certainly shared this loyalty. But he had also come up to Oxford as a Methodist. For four years he 'met in class' regularly, and he preached in the village chapels round Oxford. In later years he wrote of his distress in the conflict between the theology he had been taught and the supposed results of evolutionary science and Biblical criticism, and his hope that philosophy would provide a defence for convictions which he felt were essential to the conduct of life. After his undergraduate years he ceased to be a Methodist; but he never lost those convictions; indeed, he found increasingly in philosophy the defence for which he sought; and those who know something more of Methodism than most of Taylor's philosophical colleagues will detect in his writings the abiding influence of the Methodist emphasis on experience, however mistaken he might deem its Methodist expression.

In 1901 appeared his first important book, a formidable volume of 500 pages, *The Problem of Conduct*. Written originally, and successfully, as an essay for the Green Moral Philosophy Prize, he appeared, as he confessed, to be undermining all that Green had stood for. Going beyond Bradley's *Ethical Studies*, which at that time had long been out of print, he argued that the foundations of ethics were empirical, and lay 'apart from all metaphysical theories of freedom and the noumenal self'. The primary object of ethics is 'to effect an analysis of the moral sentiments, and understand why we approve this and condemn that'. Ethics must therefore start from psychology; and it will recognize that the term 'good' in moral judgements transcends alike æsthetic admiration and utilitarian preference. I suspect however that the chapter which most interested the author was the last. Here he enters the territory which the moralist generally leaves untrodden, 'beyond good and evil'. Morality, beginning with simple approbation and disapprobation, goes on through the development of social and religious beliefs to envisage a vast sphere of conflict between good and evil, in which both conation and free-will are irrelevant. Here we meet with what religion believes in as the perfection of the imperfect. I am what as yet I am not, but hope to be, and indeed am in God's sight. Hence, the abiding distinction between morality and religion. Each involves a contradiction which it is the business of metaphysics to transcend. Hence, too, ethics cannot be founded on metaphysics or on religion; but both ethics and religion demand and imply an emotional impulse which metaphysics must forswear.

No one can close the *Problem* without feeling that if metaphysical ethics are

to be pronounced invalid, the question of metaphysics is still not settled. Accordingly, in the short space of two years, appeared *The Elements of Metaphysics*, a work equal to its predecessor both in bulk and in the close-knit texture of its argument. In the prominence given in its pages to the nature of the Absolute and the contrast between reality and appearance, it recalls Bradley's great work, *Appearance and Reality*, published some ten years earlier. And to a theist, or more especially a Christian, its results, on a first reading, might seem as negative as Bradley's. But in his preface to the seventh edition, published in 1924 (the earlier prefaces contain nothing of the like), the author writes 'I have always wished my book to be understood in a definitely theistic, indeed a definitely Christian sense', even though, as he adds, his sense of debt to Bradley was deeper then than in 1903. Metaphysics, as the *Problem* had asserted, is 'an attempt to find the right intellectual attitude to ultimate reality'. So it was to Plato, to whom reality was the 'idea of the good', and to Aristotle, whose God was the thought of thought, 'the prime mover, itself unmoved', whose existence, lifted above the human activities of morality and conduct, was the pure energy (*actus purus*) of contemplation.

In the *Elements*, the Absolute is 'that simple absolutely transcendent source of all things which the great Christian scholastics call God'. There is indeed little of the scholastics in the *Elements*; nor had they any place in the *Problem*, or in the Oxford lecture-rooms where Taylor had sat; but, he writes in 1924, 'in speaking of the creatures as an appearance of the Absolute, I mean what St. Thomas meant by the doctrine that they have being by participation'. The significance of these references to scholasticism I shall discuss later. What the *Elements* propounds is 'a single infinite individual system, starting from the matter of fact of our own experience, and consummating itself in a teleological unity of subjective interest'. This is not to surrender to the traditional teleological 'proof' of the existence of God. We can only interpret reality by our consciousness of our life as the pursuit of our interests. But the interest of the Absolute is not in our ends, but in its — or his — own. Our experience is limited and fragmentary. 'Dissatisfaction, unfulfilled craving, and thwarted endeavours' seem to be bound together; but they are no more real than is space. The conception of space is the offspring of our own individual purposes, and, like space, these are non-existent for the Absolute, 'the conscious life which embraces the whole of things here and now, and in a perfect systematic unity, as the contents of its experience'.

To doubt the existence of such a unity is to reduce our own experience to chaos, the very thing philosophy must refuse to do. In other words, the rational is the real and the real is the rational; but (and to my mind this constitutes the abiding value of Taylor's contention) the rational is to be understood not of thought merely, nor thought and will combined, but also of feeling, purpose, interest — wherever, in fact, to use language familiar to us today, the mind is in contact with the true, the beautiful, and the good. Taylor does not, like C. C. J. Webb, discuss at length the personality of God; but when he speaks of the Absolute as the system which 'must be taken into account by any purpose that is to get fulfilment', it is no bloodless abstraction that he has in mind, any more than was the Absolute of Hegel, to whom Taylor was never, I think, quite just. It is indeed what most Christians will feel to be involved in their idea of God.

The two works which we have just considered were written while Taylor occupied his first teaching post, at Manchester. Here he was for a time a colleague of Samuel Alexander, who had a few years previously to Taylor won the Green Philosophy Prize with his *Moral Order and Progress*. In 1903 he left this country for Montreal. He came to the Philosophy Chair in St. Andrews in 1908, and he remained there till he was appointed to the professorship of Philosophy at Edinburgh, in 1924. For some years he appeared to be transferring his interest to Plato. His first work on Greek philosophy was *Aristotle and his Predecessors*, a translation of the first book of the *Metaphysics*, published while he was still at Montreal, in 1907. One can see in these pages the beginnings of the special attraction exercised over him by Socrates; and in the *Varia Socratica* (First series, 1911; the second series never appeared) Taylor marshals a vigorous set of arguments to establish the views that it is to Plato himself rather than to either Xenophon or Aristotle that we must look for the real Socrates (the Biblical student will be reminded of the similar question of the presentations of their central figure by the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel); and that the Socrates who is there discussed 'is the first thoroughly intelligible figure in the great line of succession by which Greek philosophy is indissolubly linked with Christianity on the one side and modern science on the other'. Those who are acquainted with Taylor's scholarship will not be surprised at the sweep with which he throws his net over the whole of Greek literature to establish his thesis; but they will not soon forget the Epilogue, in which he reveals his appreciation of Socrates' profound religious interest, and justifies the motto which he gives to the book, 'lay hold on eternal life'. Not the least of Taylor's equipments for argument of this sort is his tireless intellectual curiosity. Apart from a single essay on Aeschines of Sphettus, in the *Philosophical Studies* to be noticed later, no one would have been likely to suspect the extent of his acquaintance with the byways of Greek philosophical writing. Similarly, his references to Dante are few, and might appear casual; but their appositeness shows how close had been his study of the great philosopher-poet.

In the book that would of itself have sufficed to place its author in the front rank of classical scholars, *Plato*, published in 1926, at which he had clearly been working for years, he discussed the problems raised by every one of the dialogues in a manner which would have been striking in one who had devoted his attention to nothing else. The book is indispensable to every student of Greek or of universal philosophy. Why did he leave the field of metaphysics where he had so rapidly proved himself a thinker to be reckoned with? I shall not venture on an answer to this question. But the following suggestions may be made, which, I think, can be borne out by his subsequent activity. There was a certain restlessness — some would call it nervousness — in Taylor. He was never still while he talked. Mentally and intellectually, he was omnivorous. As an undergraduate he would surprise his friends by his audacious and half-serious literary projects. His former colleague at St. Andrews, Dr. John Laird, has recorded that he came to regard himself as a philosophic man of letters rather than a systematic philosopher. If that is so, he certainly misjudged himself; but there have been few philosophers who have been able to draw on such wide fields for their illustrations.

Further, the bent of his mind, as may be felt in both the *Problem* and the

Elements, was essentially though not superficially Platonic; a mind like his could not but insist on a profounder study than had been possible even for him in the ten years after he had left Oxford. But one may also suspect that he was turning to something more distinctly religious — was it the influence of the bygone years in a Methodist home? — and that having written, as he considered it, a sort of prolegomena to Christianity, he turned to Plato to prepare himself for a nearer approach to 'the first good, first perfect, and first fair'. The turning point may be found in a work which, like others of its kind, has not received the appreciation it deserved — the elaborate article on Theism in the last volume of Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. The volume was published in 1921, and Taylor brings his bibliography up to 1920. Each of the leading theistic systems is examined with the confident familiarity which was to mark his exposition of the Platonic dialogues; but his verdicts now show the Christian rather than the theist. His plan sets of necessity between the Greeks and the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century philosophers the great medieval thinkers; and his concluding paragraph, while it carries farther what we have already noticed in the *Elements*, breathes something of the fervour of the later works in which he did not disguise the fact that he wrote as a Christian.

Meanwhile, he was still ranging over the whole field of philosophical thought. His *Philosophical Studies*, which appeared in 1934, contains a lecture on 'St. Thomas Aquinas as a Philosopher', delivered in 1924 in connexion with the celebration of the sixth centenary of Aquinas. The emphasis which St. Thomas receives in Taylor's later writings marks no real transference of loyalties from the Greek to the medieval. That St. Thomas was a great Aristotelian is fully recognized; but in Aristotle's works, as many have noticed, it is necessary to distinguish between the earlier and the later Aristotle. It is in the former that one finds the disciple of Plato; and Taylor claims that it was the Platonism of Aristotle that really held St. Thomas, and, we might almost say, that made Thomas a better Aristotelian than Aristotle himself. The *Studies* also includes a lecture on Francis Bacon, delivered in 1926, and on David Hume, in 1927. Three of the essays show his continued interest in Plato; and numerous articles appeared from his pen in *Mind*, *Philosophy*, and other journals. We may here single out the paper entitled 'Truth and Freedom', in the second volume of *Contemporary Philosophy* (1924). In these volumes the editor, J. H. Muirhead, collected from living British philosophers papers in which the authors set down what they considered their own more important contentions and convictions. Here Taylor states succinctly all that is to be found in his earliest as well as his latest writings, as if attacking once more the heresies that he met on his first arrival in Oxford. He urges that man is not merely a part of the physical order; involved in all conduct is moral judgement and the appreciation of moral values; he cannot escape from the categorical imperative and the eternal distinction between good and bad.

It is probable that Taylor will be best remembered as the author of the Gifford lectures delivered at St. Andrews in 1926-8, and published in 1930; a considered and weighty presentation of the philosophy of religion. The title chosen by the author is significant: *The Faith of a Moralist*. The phrase strikes as it were a personal note for the whole work. It is the opposite of the resounding title, *Nature, Man, and God*, which another great Oxford thinker, Archbishop Temple, selected

for his Gifford lectures six years later. He forbears, as he says, to present to his readers an intimate personal statement of belief; he is not writing an Augustine's *Confessions* or a Pascal's *Thoughts*. Yet he claims that one who comes to the ultimate problems as a moralist will find the venture of faith natural. For morality is no closed system, as the *Problem* had already hinted. 'Ought' on the one hand implies a consciousness of obligation far wider than our own; a special principle of good at the heart of things; and on the other an impulse to approach to it that we cannot shake off. If space allowed, it would be interesting to note how the great topics introduced into both the *Problem* and the *Elements* recur in these two volumes. The treatment can be seen as fundamentally Platonist; but if the antithesis might be hazarded, in the earlier books we find a writer whose Platonism, rarely allowed to assert itself, has been built on a Christian foundation; in the latter volumes, his Platonism is definitely related to Christianity.

An early reader of the lectures found in them the four cardinal points of the unity of the real, the reality of the self, the 'aggression' of the eternal, and the sense of absolute dependence or derivativeness. One of the most striking lectures in the first volume is entitled 'The Initiative of the Eternal'. This is hardly suggested in the earlier books; but the last lecture of Volume I, 'The Goal of the Moral Life', might well be taken as the working out of the last chapter of the *Problem*, 'Beyond Good and Evil'; and reflection on the *Problem*, and still more on the *Elements*, might equally well start the question whether such an initiative is not necessary to the more than oneself to which both the *Problem* and the *Elements* lead.

The contents of the second volume, like those of other Gifford lectures, would probably have surprised Lord Gifford himself. The subject with which the volume opens is the question whether the authority claimed by religion must be held to be secondary, or whether it may not be true that in some sense philosophy is the handmaid of religion, or of theology. The specific claims of religion to rest on a revelation, to be historical, to rely on miracles, to be at once institutional and sacramental, are all considered and defended. Each of these claims is restated, and science and metaphysics are both led to confess that the claim cannot be denied. The ultimate appeal is to life, which is more than either. Taylor writes confessedly as a Christian; and though he refuses to admit that he has allowed authority to stifle any assertion which philosophy could justifiably make, he will not permit what religion has felt and known to be neglected. True, we do not know the whole of reality; we neither know the world as God sees it, nor God as He is in Himself. So far as this goes, we must maintain a 'sane and healthy agnosticism'. But life and experience are one; and science has no right to deny the existence of what has not and cannot come within its somewhat narrow purview.

I have referred thus briefly to the contents of these two significant volumes in order to emphasize the attitude which, to my mind, lies behind them. It is no part of my purpose in these few pages to enter on the presumptuous task of describing Taylor's religion. Yet I think Taylor himself might be the first to complain of any estimate of his work which left his religion out of account. As I understand him, he never lost the religious impressions of his boyhood. I do not suppose that he would ever have said that he was 'saved'. I doubt if he would

have called himself an evangelical Christian. In his earlier writings he avoids the language of Christianity. But his reverence for Plato — a reverence which he never reveals for Aristotle — springs from a conscious kinship with what in Plato is distinctly religious. The same is true of his conception of the significance of Socrates. And it is this warm religious interest, quickened by the greatest of the Greeks, which, as it seems to me, led him toward a new devotion to the underlying beliefs of his youth. Then came the discovery (for such it appeared) of Aquinas, the mighty exponent of the philosophical ideas lying at the base of Christianity; and as a result he found himself at home, intellectually and spiritually, in the Anglican communion. It is tempting to see in all this an example of dialectical progress; his early faith, challenged at the time by considerations he could not satisfactorily meet, gave way to a Bradleian scepticism of all presuppositions; but it was not driven out; and the Platonic conviction that the life which cannot stand up to being questioned is not worth living, led back to the belief in a transcendent goodness, reached by our experience but also its basis and guarantee. This, however, to one who had known and had not forgotten the warm vigour of the Christian faith, could not but seem to be stopping short just where advance was needed. Faith was still amidst the shadows; but it emerged when a greater than Plato described the goal at which Plato had only guessed.

I am far from assuming that Taylor himself would agree with all this. But I think it can be maintained that he never escaped from the spirit of his early surroundings. I have already alluded to the place which he gives to experience. In his frequent references to the *foi du charbonnier*, one may suspect a reminiscence of the religious experience of the miners of Kingswood and Cornwall, so familiar to the Methodists. His references to Wesley show how naturally the thought of the Methodists' 'venerable founder' returned to his mind. The fact that he sometimes goes out of his way, so to speak, to criticize Wesley's limitations, points to the same conclusion. One of the last articles he wrote was a comparison between John Wesley, as the apostle of perfection but the foe of mysticism, with St. John of the Cross, which appeared last year in the *Journal of Theological Studies*. Wesley, it is true, comes off second-best. But the strength of his work is admitted, though somewhat grudgingly; and the reader is left to wonder why the narrow-minded evangelist, as he is represented, who was neither a theologian nor an original thinker, should have exercised a wide-spread influence on the devotional life of the world denied to the clear-eyed Catholic saint. But the problem of this 'ambivalence' may be left to the psychologist.

As we have said, Taylor found his spiritual home, in the latter part of his life, in the Anglican Church. He was never an Anglo-Catholic; and when he contributed to an Anglican volume of Essays, *The Recall to Religion*, some years ago, he wrote rather as the defender of the Christian faith as a whole against unbelief than as the advocate, like most of the other contributors, of a return to 'the' Church. In the Giffords, he upholds the place, as we have seen, of institutionalism and sacramentalism in the Church; he is silent on the three-fold ministry and the invalidity of the sacraments outside its confines. One further remark may not be out of place here. Anglicans have been accustomed to twit Free Churchmen with their individualism; they set out for heaven by themselves without the guidance of the Church or the fellowship of the saints. Taylor

himself was an individualist, in the sense that he set no great store by the communion of the saints, or the maxim of *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. But as a matter of history, the true Christian fellowship has chiefly flourished outside the Catholic Church, among the various 'heretical' bodies or sects of the Middle Ages, and the post-Reformation Free Churches, like Methodism itself. Socrates, as Taylor describes him in an essay in the *Varia Socratica*, was the leader of such a religious fellowship; and though Taylor compares him to a seventeenth-century Puritan, the description he gives fits even better a Methodist society with its class-meetings, as he himself refers to them in the *Problem*.

If the above interpretation is correct, we can distinguish a definite unity in the many-sided interests and allegiances which Taylor's writings present to us. He was never tied to saying the same things, though he said them in all manner of different ways. This will have been felt by readers of his last book, *Does God Exist?* published at the time of his death, and noticed on page 177 *infra*. He is arguing as he had argued at greater length in the Giffords, and more briefly though not less cogently in various scattered articles, like 'Truth and Freedom' already mentioned, or 'Science and Morality' in the pages of *Philosophy* in 1939, where he distinguishes between 'What will happen if . . . ?' as the question of science, and 'What must I do here and now?' as the question of morals. However confidently he attacks his opponents, or, as in the instance of Hume, concedes to them what would often be refused, he never endangers his position by over-statement. Science cannot disprove the claims of religion; it must set its own house in order; and there are reasons for faith of which science knows and can know nothing. There are articles in the Christian creed, like our Lord's Resurrection from the dead, and the Virgin Birth, for which evidence such as a law-court would require is lacking; but when the whole background of history is taken into account, they become credible and as near to certainty as we have a right to expect. The authority of *sic volo, sic jubeo*, or of *Roma locuta est* cannot set itself up against philosophy; but when we consider the place of authority in our own life and thought and conduct, religion can look at philosophy with confidence rather than with fear.

Morals, religion, metaphysics. We have mapped out their respective domains. We have listened to their opposing claims, and to the dogmatic 'thus far shalt thou come, and no farther', from each. But truth is one and life is one; and we can no more divide them under these diverse pretenders to the final word than we can parcel out the realm of England into a heptarchy. Each needs the rest and is paralysed without them. For each, the quest is the same. All of us who are serious thinkers, as Taylor expressed it in the *Elements*, are seekers after the infinite. In the Epilogue to the *Varia Socratica*, the Church, the University, and all the organizations of science are

houses of the soul that, by what devious route soever, has come by the faith that she is a pilgrim to a country that does not appear, a creature made to seek not the things which are seen but the things that are eternal. . . . Philosophy . . . began as the quest for the road that leads to the city of God. . . . If the things which are seen are shaken, it is that the things which are not seen may remain.

And this is no desolating *regressus ad infinitum*. The philosopher is not a being 'ever learning yet never able to come to the knowledge of the truth'. Even if all things *abeunt in mysterium*, the mystery of the absolute or the infinite, the infinite is to be found in heaven, the union of the believer with God, in which, as Taylor finely says at the close of the first volume of the Giffords, though there may be no longer progress toward fruition, there may well be progress in fruition. The real business of life 'is not to establish the right relations to our fellows or our Maker, but to live in them', or, as he goes on, adapting Bunyan's words: 'Christ Jesus has bags of mercy that were never yet broke up or unsealed. He has nobody knows what for nobody knows who.'

To those who have ventured along the road on which Taylor pursued his quest, these words of Bunyan inevitably recall another sentence: 'It is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.' There, for Taylor, morals, religion, and metaphysics would seem to find their last word.

I have here attempted no critical estimate of Taylor's work. This is not the place, neither has the time arrived, to assess the value of Taylor's attitude or attitudes to the theological and religious issues of the time. But I have written under the conviction that the Taylor whom I knew in his undergraduate days was essentially the same as the Taylor whom we have associated for the last twenty years with Edinburgh. And as most or all of the rest who knew him in that distant period have passed away, I have tried to link, as best I might, the beginning and the consummation of a devoted life.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

MARTIN LUTHER, 1546-1946¹

A Free Church Commemoration — 21st February 1946

PHILIP MELANCHTHON broke the news of Martin Luther's death to his students in words which recalled the moment when, at the translation of Elijah, Elisha was left with the prophet's disciples, alone. 'Alas, gone is the horseman and the chariot of Israel.' An apt, if characteristic comment, for Melanchthon could never quite get himself out of any picture, least of all in this moment of bereavement when he faced the burden of a future without the man on whom he had always rather too heavily leaned. The students could hardly miss the implication that their teacher anticipated a double portion of Luther's spirit, though the more acute among them might have found it ominous that in fact Melanchthon had not been a witness of his master's passing. The comment might be made that in the event Luther's disciples and much of later Lutheranism did receive a double portion, but of the spirit of Melanchthon! But note the measuring rods of Luther's friends — they turn instinctively to the great patriarchal and prophetic figures, to Elijah and to Jeremiah, to Noah and David and Moses. There is more in this than panegyric or zeal. Here, somewhere is a giant.

¹ An address given at the Free Church Commemoration of Martin Luther in the Westminster Chapel on 21st February 1946.

I have not come to apologize for Martin Luther. I shall beg to be excused the careful admixture of praise with blame, that 'yes—but' neurosis which has cramped the style of some writers during the recent commemoration, the nervous cheers, the patronizing pats on the back of a great man who moved history, by little men with no great talent even for writing about it. I have come to thank God for one of the great among his servants and to tell you where, as I think, something of his greatness lies. 'Luther apart from the Reformation would not be Luther', wrote Julius Hare. 'His work was not something external to him. It was his very self that grew out of him, while he grew out of it.' I think I must beg this question too, big as it is, and tell you that the Reformation was a Good Thing and Very Memorable. But a word of warning. I do not know who have done most harm, historians who know no theology or the theologians who are careless of that historical context without which theology is but half explained. We do no service to anybody by lining in the colours of history and by over-darkening the medieval scene, which was indeed sombre enough.

How easily remote it would be if we could think of that church as altogether stinking and corrupt, in the hands of profligates, sots, perverts, cowards, shufflers, when for us all there is the warning in the fact that in that day also there were not lacking able, earnest, well meaning, gifted, pious men, some of them men of genius, in the fact that never had there been so many new religious movements or so many good books read as in the half century preceding Luther. And yet it is true that the final word on that age was scrawled over the altar of the Pope's chapel by Michelangelo in that vision of Judgement on the Church and on Christendom by a Christ risen in wrath, his arm raised to strike like the levin.

Those who sigh after some alternative reformation 'from within' which might have been but for Luther can hardly have considered the long centuries during which 'reform of the church in head and members' had lain unsettled on a thousand clerical agendas. What prospect was there that Rome would or ever will spontaneously yield the very minimum of the changes which the highest of high anglicans demand as the price of their reconciliation (even allowing for the hardening effect of three centuries of ultramontaniam)? It is customary to describe this wholly imaginary alternative as being 'along Erasmian lines'. I fear these Erasmian lines mask an illusion as dangerous as the famous lines of Maginot. I seem to see four hundred years of European intellectuals entrenched behind these lines, beautiful and ineffectual angels who have never considered the gravity of sin, themselves very neatly by-passed by forces of human evil which have compassed us all with the threat of ruin, and for which they cannot escape a measure of responsibility.

But no: it was time to 'pluck up and break down'. You do not get dry rot out of a house by giving it another coat of paint. As I see it, the breakdown of the medieval world was inevitable. In any age what are the greatest men but imp surrounded by giant forces? We must take into full account the vast political, economic and social pressures which were transforming Luther's world and with which a sick and enfeebled Church was quite incapable of coping. What Luther did was to make sure that if there should be conflict in Christendom it should be the right fight in the right place. But for him the Reformation

movement must have centred in the secondary issues which had preoccupied the Lollards and were to obsess the Schwärmerei, if indeed the whole matter of the Reformation had not been swallowed up in a dark tide of human greed and pride, and lost among the fierce secular energies of a modern world. Luther foresaw quite clearly that he must bring destruction and suffering. But to those who see in him and him alone the troubler of Israel, there is a sufficient answer, 'I have not troubled Israel, but thou, and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord'.

I have spoken of Michelangelo's vision of a Christ risen in wrath, yet it was Luther who saw through the same terrors, the same judgement, a Christ stretching out his hands over his world in mercy. 'Luther', said John Foxe, 'gave the stroke and plucked down the foundation and all by opening one vein, wherein lieth the touchstone of all truth and doctrine, as the only principal origin of our salvation, which is our free justifying by Faith only in Christ, the Son of God.' Luther had reopened the great Biblical theme of the Righteousness of God and here was the making and the meaning of the Protestant Reformation.

It was, in the first place, a private affair with no immediate reference to Church scandals or public affairs. And yet to understand how Luther came to this point when the Church of God itself became a prison, and the promises of God in prayers and liturgy only voices of condemnation is to come to the heart, not only of the sickness of one man, but of the decay of Christendom. As he looked about him Luther saw men lulled into self deception, knowing neither the gravity of sin nor the cost of grace, fobbed off with the cheap graces of those who touted the divine mercies for money, or seeking to escape by ascetic severities a judgement in comparison with which the most devoted human sacrifice appears trivial and irresponsible. It was then he found his gospel in the Righteousness of God in the mercies of Christ, that guilty men stand before the living God not on ground of their own merits or of their own character however supernaturally endowed, but on the sole continuing ground of the Righteousness of God. And it is no accident that the discovery brought him face to face with the dirtiest racket of a racket-ridden Church. All the rest followed. 'I will make thee a defenced city' — and the name of that defenced city, that 'feste Burg', was Mansoul. All he had to do was to keep unsundered its integrity. But there was much virtue in that 'all'.

Looking back we can see great forces on his side. It has been said of the great strokes of military art that they look very simple — afterwards. Really, we might almost have thought of them ourselves! But place yourself in the moment of doubt and suspense weighed down with the consequences of an inexorable decision . . . so was it with Luther in these years when one decision after another had to be made, amid a strain which left its mark on body and nerve and left him a spent old man before his time. Here was no loud-mouthed fanatic with a hide like a rhinoceros, but a man who could only face the charges, the taunts and reproaches of his enemies because he had heard them all before in his own tormenting self-questioning whispered abroad by the adversary in the very streets of Mansoul. We little people who never poke beyond the pattern of thought and behaviour into which we are cast can hardly understand what it meant for him to make his great bold decisions, the decisions which some man must make when God does a new thing in the earth. 'For

what I ask', he said, 'is not new that faith does? Was it not a new thing when the Apostles instituted their ministry? Was it not a new thing when Abraham offered his son? Was it not new when Israel crossed the sea? Will it not be a new thing when I shall pass from death to life?'

And so on one side the fightings and the fears and yet because the 'feste Burg' can only be betrayed from within, on the other that white hot confidence in God which will go to Worms despite innumerable devils and go about its business though it rain Duke Georges, that superb *παρησια* you find in the Acts of the Apostles and in one or two letters of John Wesley and I think in not many places besides.

And it is not the least important thing about Martin Luther that he offends us all by refusing to fit our categories. He lived when all was in the melting pot and before Protestantism had hardened. I sometimes think we have no Protestants today but only in the significant jargon of the R.A.F. some 'nice types' and some of them not so nice. But Luther was no 'type', not even a Lutheran or a Protestant type and as he stands athwart both worlds, Catholic and Protestant, we must look before and after if we would understand him. Well, Luther won his war. He did something which need not to be done again. Protestantism has her own temptations and her own sins but at least there are some forms of evil, some tyrannies, and some obscurantisms which we cannot and never will abide. And it is not least among the fruits of Luther's life that the Roman Church herself must undertake to set her house in order. I cannot speak of how Luther opened his Second Front against the left wing of the reformation movement, against the Sacramentaries and the Iconoclasts and the misinterpretation as he felt it to be, of his doctrines of faith and Christian liberty, except as a disciple of John and Charles Wesley to agree that in religious matters, even more than in political the Left is never Right! The Reformation movement partly explains Luther: but it also obscures him, for in the great tide of historical events we tend to miss the creative side of his work. Those grievously err who see in the Protestant Reformation a merely negative and destructive movement. Who in 1510 could have dreamed that within a generation there would exist new forms of Christian language and worship, clothed in new forms of Christian institution and discipline, new pieties capable of growth, of transmutation and development, of nourishing innumerable souls?

Consider his literary work: the vast correspondence in that small, neat, scholarly hand which overflows many volumes and dealt with practical and spiritual problems across half Europe. And the serried ranks, row upon row of his other writings, witness to the prodigious energy which produced something like a writing a fortnight over twenty-five years. It goes without saying that much of it is second rate and ephemeral but much also is of imperishable worth. He was a superb pamphleteer and left scores of pamphlets, every one of which was what Humpty Dumpty would call a 'nice knock-down argument for you'. And he wrote from his heart, and out it all came, tumbling hot and choking in anger, or shaking with rocking laughter. Always lucid, always clear as crystal, able to be understood of the people.

For the rest, compare the list of those who in England must do a work comparable to his. He gave his people their open Bible. He was to his people what

Tyndale was to us, if anything his German Bible the more important. He could shape a liturgy almost as well as Thomas Cranmer, though he did not fall into the English error of abolishing that variety which the true life of liturgy demands. Luther wrote a classical catechism which has really no parallel in England (for even the Shorter Catechism hardly survives its magnificent opening). He was as great a preacher as Latimer and his sermons had effect comparable with the book of Homilies. For a collection like his hymns you have to wait in England until Isaac Watts. His commentaries and theological works have never been fully explored, let alone exhausted. You remember how John Bunyan got hold of the Galatians and said, 'I found my condition in his experience so largely and profoundly handled as if the book had been written out of my heart', and how the reading of Luther's preface to the Romans was the occasion of John Wesley's conversion. Thus Luther did almost alone in twenty years what six notable Englishmen took the span of two centuries to accomplish: besides that which came upon him daily, the care of the Churches, the fight against Popery and the fanatics, the forming of a communion which is still recognizably his debtor. And this is to say nothing of his services to education and Church music and twenty other weighty matters.

But we may not end by looking at his work. The man counts, too. To our six Englishmen we must add a seventh. In the Strand there stands a figure, burly and blunt, reading from out an open book. It might almost — *mutatis mutandis* — be Luther with his open Bible, but it is Samuel Johnson with his dictionary. I think the two men had much of their greatness in common, in their plain common sense, their humour and their melancholy, their delight at shocking their companions, the pathos of inner struggles, and the loyalty and love they contrived to keep among their friends. Perhaps Luther was less fortunate in the dozen or so inferior Boswells who were permitted to frequent his table and whose garbled and sometimes fuddled remembrances were not always faithful and true. But at least we can see both Luther and Johnson at home. Nobody ever wore his heart more on his sleeve than Luther and there, for all to see, are his fun and his tenderness, his deep love of his family and home, his simplicity, his mighty prayers, yes and the vulgarity and pigheadedness which prevent us thinking of him as some stained-glass figure, or cloying his memory with the romanticism which has disfigured St. Francis or St. Thomas More.

Luther has still theology to teach: among his doctrines still fruitful for us are these: First, the profound doctrine of the Word which is the Gospel, out of which the Church and Scriptures derive, the Word in which God meets his Creation, in Jesus Christ. Then, derivatively, the doctrine of Justification by Faith, with its implications of assurance and of Christian Liberty, of sanctification in the Spirit and of the life of love, a doctrine which may not be cramped in the rigid individualism of some forms of evangelical pietism since it proclaims the entry by the believer into the world of the triumphant Christ. Then the doctrine of the Priesthood of All Believers, poles asunder from the modern heresy of the laity of all the Priesthood, the doctrine that parsons and laymen are equal, especially the laymen, and that all life is secular. While tearing up clericalism, Luther's doctrine did assert the solidarity of believers in the communion of saints. Luther's defenced city, his Feste Burg, is more peopled than that Interior castle in Spain which St. Teresa was building. It is significant

that that heroic modern Lutheran Dr. Asmussen has based his recent fine theological defence of the Stuttgart Declaration of October 1945 in which the German Evangelical Church associates itself with the guilt of the German people, exactly and precisely upon this very doctrine of the Priesthood of all Believers.

And there is much for us to learn in his very rich, though not too coherent doctrine of the Church. How profound and simple is his saying: 'Thank God, a child of seven knows what the Church is, namely the holy believers and the lambs who hear their shepherd's voice. It is he who restores the thought of the Church as a fellowship of believers while never losing hold of the truth in the idea of a *Volkskirche*, and while never failing to see the Church also as a hospital, that "Church of pardoned sinners exulting in their saviour" (C. Wesley). I find the whole matter of the great Divide in this: that Cardinal Bellarmine's definition of the Church included as its fifteenth note, 'Of the temporal felicity of the true Church', while Luther placed as the seventh and climactic note, to be the 'Church under the Cross'. And finally there is Luther's doctrine of the meaning of secular life and of the calling of the Christian man in this life and that which is to come.

It was simpler than I have suggested: I have not mentioned the things in our bones, our glorious platitudes, of the Open Bible and freedom from papal tyranny, of the liberties opened up for us through Luther's work. Nor have I mentioned the hard things Luther might say to us. He never had to consider the Free Church Council. But he did say 'Blessed is the man who hath not sat in the council of the sacramentarians or stood in the way of the Zwinglians nor sat in the chair of the men of Zurich'. He would have sighed to see our day, as some of us must sigh, when our heritage has been made to wear so very thin. And yet I think we Free Churchmen ought to understand what Luther meant better than most. We were not tempted, as our Anglican friends have sometimes been, to write 'the temporal felicity of Christians' among the marks by which the true Church may be known. We should know, for our fathers have told us, that the Church must be the 'Church under the Cross', and stand nearer than any to the followers of Luther who have learned this truth anew in these last years.

It would be indecent to commemorate Martin Luther in February 1946 if we left it there; if the thought of that solemn funeral procession winding the streets of Wittenberg four hundred years ago did not remind us that tonight there are other funerals in that Russian zone where also the mourners go about the streets. There are large areas of Europe where Protestantism has been grievously, perhaps mortally wounded. What have we said about it? Dare we pay homage to the great rebel, and applaud his daring and go contentedly away smug with the passing of some resolution or, with even greater boldness, the sending of a deputation to the Prime Minister? Have we even considered risking our reputation (already a little damaged) by solemnly rebuking our nation and our government? Must we always limp behind the pacifists and the left wing intellectuals and plead in the name of humanity and never, never speak to our people of what they must say and do simply for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ? I cannot thank God for Martin Luther without remembering Martin Niemöller who was howled down by German students last week for taking such a risk and making such a gesture for the sake of Christians every-

where and I cannot remember either without knowing that they both, Martin Luther and Martin Niemöller were Germans and my brothers in Christ. At least, must we not affirm our solidarity with them and reaffirm our solemn responsibility as Free Churchmen for Protestantism in Europe?

The World Council of Churches has met in Geneva, a faint approach to that 'Free, Christian Council' of which all the great reformers dreamed. In Rome the new Cardinals out of every nation have received their hats. And around us all lies a world perishing in darkness and unbelief and over us all stands our Lord Jesus with his Cross. Luther would point us to Him and Him above all else, and we may thank God, because the fact of Martin Luther stands at last for the mending of Christendom and for the healing of our nations.

GORDON RUPP

DR. ARCHIBALD W. HARRISON

THE death of Dr. Harrison less than half-way through his Presidential year was a blow on the heart that was felt not only by his family and personal friends but by the whole Connexion. Compared with some Methodist leaders who have remained active in their eighties he was a young man. The dramatic suddenness of his passing intensified the shock. Although, to his regret, so little of his ministerial life had been spent in circuit work, few better deserved the title of travelling preacher. For many years it was his duty and delight to journey up and down Methodist England. He made countless friends in every part of the country. He was not only in Methodism but of it. His love of the Methodist people was ardent and spontaneous. *Cor ad cor loquitur*. He was one of them and they loved him in return.

Dr. Harrison's life-time of sixty-two years coincided with an amazing revolution in the thoughts and habits of his fellow-countrymen, both within Methodism and the nation at large. It is not too much to say that those six decades witnessed greater changes than any sixty years in our history.

I. THE BACKGROUND

Perhaps the most significant feature of the environment in which Dr. Harrison's boyhood was spent was the efflorescence of scriptural names. In addition to commoner ones such as Abraham, Jacob, Joshua, Elijah, Samuel, Matthew, there was a crop of exceptional specimens — Amos, Zechariah, Ebenezer, Abigail, Hephzibah, Solomon, Josiah, Zadok, Alphæus, Jabez, Ezra. We lived under Biblical auspices. Today such names are impossible. The change is not in fashions but in fundamentals.

All water was drawn from pumps or private wells or carried in buckets from common springs. There was not a tap or a bathroom in the place. Life revolved strenuously but tranquilly round the three points of home, business, and chapel. The social geography of the chapel was instructive. From the august back pews of the central block (cushioned, hassocked, and with private cupboards) occupied by the best people, one proceeded forward by well-marked gradations to the rows of free seats at the front. The side-seats though still respectable were of lower status, excepting four large square pews flanking

the pulpit, whose prestige was undisputed. The galleries, apart from the front row, were free, and peopled by nondescripts — mostly young men on one side, and young women on the other. A few restive souls rented the upstairs front seats, but their action was a distinct breach of recognized custom. Marriage between occupants of different seat-areas was deprecated and unusual. These social arrangements, though not rigid, were clearly visible, and were accepted with little or no resentment as being in the nature of things.

The homes of the better-to-do were adorned with such pictures as Doré's 'Christ leaving the Praetorium' or Noel Paton's florid allegories, together, of course with engravings of the 'Burning of Epworth Rectory', the Death-Bed of Wesley, and portraits of famous Methodist preachers. The politically-minded might have also some picture of Oliver Cromwell or Gladstone.

The cottages were hung with coloured Biblical prints — Abraham authoritatively dismissing Hagar, Jacob inspecting the blood-stained coat of many colours, Naomi and Ruth, The Brazen Serpent, Daniel in the den of lions. Such books as were read were *Pilgrim's Progress*, denominational works of theology and devotion, biographies of Wesley and his lieutenants. Practically all members of Society possessed their own Bible and Hymn-book which were generally left in their pews.

The week's programme was crowded: Sunday morning Prayer Meeting at 7, Sunday School at 9 and 2, Chapel at 10.30 and 6.15, the evening service being invariably followed by an 'After-meeting'. Monday night was mostly given up to Class Meetings in which inability or reluctance to give one's experience would have aroused serious misgivings. On Tuesday, more Classes and Band of Hope. On Wednesday, sewing-meeting and week-night Service, later followed by Wesley Guild — an innovation regarded by old stagers with suspicion. Many public tea-meetings were also held on this day. On Friday the weekly Prayer Meeting, followed by some Church business meeting. On Saturday the Band Meeting (this lapsed during our childhood).

The Chapel was the religious, social, cultural, headquarters. It took the place now filled by lecture-room, concert-hall, theatre, cinema, community centre, and circulating library. Following a hard week's work, Sunday was the busiest day of all. After taking part in three or four services, local Preachers often walked eight or ten miles to a village 'appointment'. Nevertheless, Sunday activities were discharged with astonishing zest. The Lord's Day was a festival full of interest and refreshment. The Band of Hope was run by a few enthusiasts; Teetotalism was not yet regarded as a *sine qua non* of the Christian life. The moral standards — punctuality, independence, honesty, truthfulness, industry — were strict. 'Immorality' among chapel members was rare and was regarded as an indelible disgrace.

At the 'social evenings' following a tea-meeting, local artists would sing 'Excelsior', 'What are the Wild Waves Saying', 'The Village Blacksmith', or one of the more recherché Moody and Sankeys, or recite 'The Burial of Moses', 'The Destruction of Sennacherib', or 'The Leper'. Community-singing of favourite hymns would close the proceedings. Missionary meetings gave a touch of romance to the chapel time-table. It was exciting to hear a missionary 'on furlough' describe hairbreadth escapes, fantastic customs, the heroism of converts, and the incomparable blue of the Pacific Ocean lapping the shores

of the Fiji Islands. Occasional local colour was obtained by the use of a magic lantern or native exhibits. The high-water mark of realism was reached by the sudden dash from the vestry of a genuine Zulu prince with shield and assegais, in full war-paint.

The circuit 'plan' too, had red-letter days. Famous preachers, objects of flattering homage, would visit our country quarters for the week-end, winding up on the Monday night with a popular lecture on 'The Monk that Shook the World', 'The Men of the Mayflower', or 'Romanism, the Cause of National Decadence'. It is a mistake to dismiss our grandfathers and grandmothers as dull, or their employments as tedious.

Besides the church, the sects were handsomely represented — Wesleyan, Baptist, Independents, Quakers, Salvation Army. There was not a Catholic in the little town. Protestant noses still sniffed the smoke of Smithfield. Nobody was troubled with theological doubts. These good Methodists would have marvelled at unbelief as a sign either of ignorance or obliquity. The lurid end of atheists was a familiar theme.

The passing months were illuminated by old-time observances — Twelfth Night, Plough Monday, Royal Oak Day (my favourite), Hallow-e'en, the ceremonial processions, gay with scarves and banners, of the Friendly Societies.

Board Schools had not yet banished dialect and picturesqueness of pronunciation, which had changed little from Wesley's day. One heard many old-fashioned words and Saxon plurals — childer, housen, closen, and the like.

Few men earned two pounds a week — the bulk not twenty shillings. The average wage of Methodist cottage folk would not exceed fifteen shillings, out of which anything from one shilling and sixpence to two shillings and sixpence would go for rent. Yet the people were clean and respected themselves and others. Out of their modest resources they managed to possess a Sunday suit (the suit of reverence), a top hat, or in the humbler strata, a felt 'billy-cock'. They paid class and ticket-money and put their mite into the collecting plate. Nothing was spent in amusements or travelling; plenty of the older folk had never been in a train, or three miles from home. 'Holidays' were practically unknown. Such books as they had were presents or prizes.

The rural hierarchy remained pretty well intact — the Hall, his Lordship's agent, the brewer, the vicar, the gentry, lawyers and doctors, the tanner and the old fashioned wine-merchant, farmers, shop-keepers, tradesmen, gardeners, basket-makers, and labourers. Women worked in the mill or clocked stockings at home. The curtsy to the vicar's wife and the gentle-folk still survived. It is fashionable nowadays to pity this 'benighted' generation. Such pity is misplaced and impertinent. Our boyhood was surrounded by people who were happy, dignified, rooted and grounded in religion, free from modern restlessness and rancour, who went through life with confidence and faced death in sure and certain hope. Chapel-consciousness has been largely superseded by class-consciousness. This is called 'progress'; modesty would be content to say 'change'. In the Castle Donington of our childhood Jane Austen might have lived agreeably (I used to imagine her in certain houses that I thought suitable), and even Dr. Grantly would have found life tolerable. Whereas today!

Children paid two-pence or three-pence a week for school-fees. Few bothered with newspapers. The Queen's two jubilees were a crowning demonstration of

national well-being. Old England was unassailable behind her wooden walls. No war-cloud darkened the sky, though some people were scared at the rising income-tax which reached sixpence in the pound!

Country-life, intensified by the Methodist training, produced many men of force and ability, as well as a number of 'characters' — personalities full of tang (some of them flamboyant and grotesque) who might have stepped straight out of Dickens. There was in that world a richer variegation than in the mass-produced citizenry of today. Membership of the Methodist Society may have tempered idiosyncrasy; but, even more indubitably, stimulated it.

On the whole the horizon of those village Methodists was wider than that of their successors. The Bible and the grand vistas of Christian experience were their 'daily walk and ancient neighbourhood'. Their windows were open to the Eternal.

II THE LIFE

More than fifty-five years ago a son of the manse, a robust boy with large round head, put a fateful question to a slighter lad nearly two years his junior — 'Will you come on Saturday and play in our garden?' I went. That Saturday was the first of a long series. The garden was a boy's paradise. A mighty walnut furnished with trapeze was our G.H.Q. At its foot stood a hut the walls of which were pasted over with engravings of Methodist preachers. A great patch of arable served as our footer-field. There were endless trees to be climbed, a circular path for a running-track, a cricket pitch, and a fascinating miscellany of farm buildings. Field sports ended, we cultivated photography (huddled inside a piano packing-case fitted with red pane — our developing room). Indoors we printed and published a literary magazine whose circulation was far below its merits, studied the strategic intricacies of the Franco-German war, and read all sorts of books, sitting at either end of the sofa, our feet touching in the middle. It was in that kitchen (I have loved kitchens ever since) that we worked through our first French story — Dumas' *L'Evasion du Duc de Beaufort*, harrowed our feelings with Q's *Dead Man's Rock*, and came under the spell of Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*. We were fond of walking and explored the countryside for miles around. In particular we loved the Trent and knew its course intimately from Swarkestone Bridge to Nottingham. Even now I can recall our excitement at discovering the places where Soar and Derwent joined the main stream. We felt like Speke at the sources of the Nile. Fishing was my delight. It never interested him. The condition of his accompanying me was that he should sit on the bank and read aloud. In this way, with my eyes on the float and my ears intermittently attentive to my masterful lector, I was introduced to *The Bible in Spain*. In those days we went together to Loughborough Grammar School. Winter and summer there was a 7 a.m. train to catch, after a mile walk. During our five years we never missed it. This day-boy discipline was followed by a course at University College, Nottingham, which involved a daily cycle-ride of twenty-six miles.

After taking inter-B.Sc. at Nottingham, religious interests advanced to the foreground. His thoughts had turned, in his late teens, to the Ministry, his father's vocation. I became aware of the U.B.H.S., 'Banks', 'Gregory', Robertson's *Sermons*, Bigg's *Modern Anglican Theology*, and a pungent volume

entitled *Sidelights on the Conflicts of Methodism*—a book to which he made humorous reference in his Presidential address.

Endowed with great physical strength, much more than average knowledge, a deep sense of 'call' and a militant loyalty to the Church of his fathers, he was accepted as a Probationer in 1902 when twenty years of age. His first experience of ministerial work was in the Cinderford Circuit where, a generation before, his father had laboured. A re-reading of old letters makes it clear that the life of study, preaching, and pastoral intercourse was entirely congenial. His conversion was a process rather than a crisis. It was a gradual and orderly self-dedication in answer to a call that became increasingly clear. He sums up—'No sudden change, much slackness, many falls, much coldness, nevertheless abundant tokens of the mercy and grace and love of God, and a keen sense of His nearness and power.' The scene now shifts to Didsbury. In spite of its unexhilarating architecture and surroundings, 'The Old Ship' exercised a singular spell upon his spirit and became his real *alma mater*. My friend had then three ambitions—to take his degree, to develop into an efficient outside-left, and to become a successful lover. Dogged perseverance, together with a succouring Providence, enabled him to achieve them all. It was at Didsbury, after a year's grim concentration (with little tutorial assistance) that he took his B.Sc.—B.D. followed two years later. Three strenuous, happy years were succeeded by a similar period as Assistant Tutor. This is an office in which it is easy to fail. To discharge tutorial functions to coevals, in the absence of tutorial authority, is a test of character and tact. Most of his Didsbury contemporaries would agree that he came well out of the ordeal. Standing little upon ceremony and eschewing academical airs, his knowledge, devotion to duty, his preaching and manliness, won general admiration and affection.

College duties did not so completely engross him as to leave no time for other pursuits. As a result of these extra-professional activities he became engaged to Miss Elsie Simon, youngest daughter of Dr. J. S. Simon, the governor of Didsbury and learned historian of Methodist origins. The marriage (*quorum pars minima fui*—as best man) took place in St. Paul's, the college chapel, in 1910. Mrs. Harrison's passionate cult of the Wesley saga, her love of Methodism and her striking gifts as a writer, made her a stimulating comrade as well as a devoted wife and mother. It was a happy, an inspiring marriage. A friend may be allowed to emphasize the creative felicity of this partnership. Dr. Harrison's later letters bemoan his frequent absence from home. He once told me that he never left Elsie without a pang and never returned without a feeling of rapture.

Our education together at Loughborough, Nottingham, and Didsbury, left us with a host of memories in common; nor did we leave the flame of friendship untrimmed. Armed with painfully inadequate wherewithal we embarked upon a series of walking and cycling tours, both in England and abroad. We made pilgrimages, for example, to Shropshire and Dorset with Housman and Hardy in mind. It was with him that I first saw the splendours of Normandy and, later, the enchantments of Touraine. The culmination of our travelling was in 1939 when 'the grand quadrilateral', two husbands and wives, did the Hellenic Tour and shared the ecstasy of visits to Pompeii and Palermo, to Greece and the Aegean Isles, to Constantinople and windy Troy.

In a word, our lives were like two trees side by side; they were not quite of the

same species, their foliage differed, but they sprang from the same soil and their roots were inseparately intertwined. In the fullness of time he was my best man (as I had been his). I helped to bury his father as he did mine. He and I wept together by his mother's grave. My mother and his father were laid to rest in the village cemetery the same afternoon. Through all the years I was, I believe, as welcome in his home as he was in mine. We were looking forward with delight to entertaining him and his wife this March, in our new home in Liverpool, on his Presidential visit to Merseyside. His last letters were affectionate even beyond his wont. The last of his five visits to Lampeter — to preach for me in Wycliffe College Chapel — was treasured by us both as notably happy. It was our last meeting.

Of me he wrote to a correspondent: 'Frederick is always a stimulating irritant, sent to us by God — no doubt for our good.' Well, it is something to have gained a reputation as a not unwholesome astringent! An ominous note began to sound in his letters. In October 1944 he writes: 'I am so tired that I can scarcely crawl. I have got to the point when the very thought of trains frightens me.' In February 1945: 'I seriously think I shall have to go away or run into some trouble of mind or body. Next year is likely to be a bigger strain than ever. Five years of war travel in England is much worse than three and a half years of active service in the last war.' A few days before the end, he wrote: 'I am bearing up fairly well, but may meet my Waterloo on the way to —.' The thought of him collapsing, and dying on his knees in his host's bedroom, brought to my mind the last cry of Porthos borne down under an insupportable weight — '*Trop lourd!*' That he, one of life's immutables, should go first seems a reversal of nature. My friend had an extraordinary resemblance to his grandfather, the G.O.M. of local preachers, an amazingly virile old gentleman who thundered away in Midland pulpits till well on in the nineties. I used to twit Archie about his probable longevity, and speculate on the funeral oration which it would be at once his honour and embarrassment to deliver over me! Alas, the ravages of two such wars as our grandsires never knew, had gone too deep. So it fell to my lot to lay him to rest in that old Methodist village colony where lie his people and mine, and where a great piece of my own heart lies buried in his grave.

'O ma jeunesse, c'est vous que l'on enterre.'

Reverting to Didsbury, it is seemly to mention one of his college friends for whom he had a special regard — W. F. Howard. He writes to me (February 1905): 'Howard preached last Sunday morning in the college chapel. There is no man in the place I admire as I do Howard for his lofty ideals and impulsive knight-errantry.' He was much impressed by 'Howard's Latinisms perfectly pronounced'. This student intimacy was deepened when (during Dr. Simon's Presidency) Howard returned to Didsbury as President's Assistant. Those who know the two men recognized a peculiar felicity in their conjunction, *par nobile fratum*, at the Nottingham Conference when Dr. Howard invested his old friend with the symbols of Presidential dignity — no doubt to the accompaniment of 'Latinisms perfectly pronounced'. This honourable partnership, begun forty-two years before in the dim corridors of Didsbury, survived Dr. Harrison's death. For it was Dr. Howard who pronounced, in Wesley's Chapel, the official tribute to the dead President and who, for the rest of this Methodist year, must deputize for his fallen friend.

After the intellectual and romantic ardours of Didsbury, Dr. Harrison had his first real spell of circuit work in a quintessential Lancastrian town. There was no place in the country where Robert Blatchford and his newspaper were so reverently appreciated. H. M. Hyndman in person and Karl Marx in print were the twin divinities of the Burnley 'workers'. Aggressive egalitarianism and slap-dash secularism were a chastening combination. None could have toiled more conscientiously than the young minister, by brotherhoods, open-air lectures and debates, topical sermons and unclerical pose, to reclaim a back-sliding proletariat. My friend had at that time keen sympathy with the aims of the Methodist Union for Social Service — sponsored by the two Manchester Samuels — Keeble and Collier. In his study, a large picture of St. Francis, his patron saint, hung prominently. My friend's experience among Lancastrian Marxians would have sobered Il Poverello himself. So it was that the grim shadows of reality dulled the radiant surface of a youthful academic socialism. Nor has that surface ever again been susceptible of its pristine polish. Burnley was a portent. Dr. Harrison's Presidential address showed how profoundly he had been disturbed by that early blast of atheistic socialism.

During his term at Burnley (and later, in Bristol, where she died) his mother had the happiness and solace of making her home with him. A sensitive nature absorbs many influences, but there can be no doubt that the decisive factor in his career was his mother. Few women have borne a more crushing succession of calamities; yet her faith and courage triumphantly surmounted every trial. Love suffered long and was kind.

He who writes these lines would now record his debt of gratitude to one who graciously rose above her own tragic preoccupations, and showed to her son's friend endless patience and an almost maternal lovingkindness. She lived again in the son of whom she was so proud, and quietly held at bay in him a lurking tendency to the *farouche*.

During his happy period in Bristol (always to him a congenial city) the Great War broke out. In 1915, after many searchings of heart, he felt constrained to leave Church, home, wife, and three little children, and to join the colours. As a subaltern in the Devons, and afterwards as Chaplain, he saw the fighting in the Immortal Salient and the horrors of Passchendaele, and was awarded the Military Cross for gallantry in July 1918. One of the most valuable parts of his Pastoral Address was his interpretation of the difficulties of demobilized soldiers returning to civil life after the fearful diversion of war. With more success than most he overcame the post-war *malaise* and solved the problems of readjustment. But the war left its mark upon him and he admitted that it took him years to recover.

After a short spell as superintendent of the Highgate Circuit, he became in 1921 Dr. Workman's Assistant at Westminster Training College, succeeding him as Principal in 1930. Some regretted this removal from the highway of the ministerial vocation into a bypath. He held, on the other hand, that on becoming a professional educationist he by no means resigned his 'ministry'. Indeed, it may be that his new sphere offered wider scope for Christian service than any circuit could give. As teacher, friend, and spiritual father of hundreds of schoolmasters, he fulfilled a vital pastoral office. He was one who made a difference to men's lives. It was probably an advantage that the new Principal

was not the conventional product of one of the older universities. He appreciated the need of adapting education to a new social situation. Walter Bagehot said of Guizot: 'He stands like a schoolmaster in the playground, without sport and without pleasure, grim and sullen, slow and awful.' To play the portentous official was not my friend's delight. Sportsman as well as scholar, refreshingly devoted to cricket and football, he was content to be a man among men. Nevertheless, students who interpreted his homely manners as a warrant for experiments in familiarity sustained a shock. Few things were harder to laugh off than a rebuke from 'Prinny'. During his tenure the Westminster curriculum was revolutionized. The old two-years' certificate course was superseded by a four-years' course at London University, leading to a degree in Arts or Science and the Diploma in Education. The fact that so much of the students' academic work took place outside the college gave added importance to the role of Westminster as a community, a centre of professional training, and a school of Christian manhood. Even before the fearful corroboration of two world wars, Dr. Harrison believed that education, apart from a Christian basis, was a very doubtful blessing. In 1926 the degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by the London University for a thesis on 'Arminianism'. He also amused himself during his Westminster career by taking an Arts degree.

In my frequent visits to the College I observed that the staff were not only a strenuous but a happy family. This was largely due to the personality of the Principal. When he and I, as boys, thrilled to Dumas' portrayal of manly comradeship in his immortal *Musketeers*, we did not realize that we were receiving an indelible impression. Yet so it was. The equal, free, robust, chivalrous *camaraderie* of men still seems to me the most glorious of human relationships. Those who knew him best would agree that Archie Harrison was outstandingly a 'good companion'.

When I think of summing up my friend's work among students I find myself remembering Edmond Scherer's judgement on De Tocqueville: 'De Tocqueville is a talent in the service of a character.' To his friends Archie Harrison was not first a scholar or preacher or functionary, but a man. He was sincere and he was serious. These are great qualities and rare. He taught his pupils to see in life not a problem to solve but a calling to fulfil. Let the curious look at life as a spectacle, the epicurean as an entertainment, the pessimist as a piece of irony; the Christian is not permitted the luxury of being a theorist (=a spectator). Life is a high, often a stern, vocation. We are entrusted with it by God and must 'live as ever in our great Taskmaster's eye'. Those who, in their plastic years, were pupils of Dr. Harrison have not much to unlearn.

Among the host of those who mourn his death, none are more bereaved than his old Westminster men, whose feelings were movingly represented by the quivering grief, the affectionate gratitude of J. S. Ross the present Principal. My friend was not one of Montaigne's disciples, *divers et ondoyant*; yet for all his strong convictions he was able to appreciate men of other views and camps. It must be admitted that he was not strongly tempted to Rome! (I remember being shocked by his outburst that he would rather have Gilbert Murray than Hilaire Belloc.) But generally speaking, provided a man were sincere and strenuous, he could respect him whatever his label. The only thing that roused him to wrath was cynicism. Moral flippancy revolted him. The ironical attitude

was no 'cosy pillow' to him. He never really cared for French literature. Life was too earnest for the delicate perversity, the exquisite malice, which is the breath of Gallic nostrils. All his life through he shrank from sophistication and remained at heart 'a simple soul'.

There was a singular coherence in his career. I recall the first time (it was in 1900) that he went up to the Communion Rail at the evening prayer-meeting — a stripling among the elders and rabbis. He quoted the lines

With Thee conversing we forget
All time, and toil, and care;
Labour is rest, and pain is sweet,
If Thou, my God, art here.

He never changed his text. During his prayers and sermons at Wycliffe College just a year ago, I could plainly hear the accents of his youth. There is a text in the Old Testament that exactly fits his case: 'And Isaac digged again the wells of water which they had digged in the days of Abraham his father, and he called their names after the names by which his father had called them.' To change the metaphor — he reminded the old Methodist coin; but it was the old gold he used, and the image and superscription were essentially the same.

His researches into Methodist origins and history were enshrined in several books: *The Beginning of Arminianism*; the 1942 Fernley Lecture on *The Evangelical Revival and Christian Reunion*; and the Wesley Historical Society's Lecture (1945) on *The Separation of Methodism from the Church of England*. A word should also be said about the careful manuals of Christian doctrine and of Biblical interpretation which he wrote for teachers. As the years went by, his faithful work won for him a position of leadership in his own Church, and a national reputation as an expert on education. Along the royal road of departmental administration (as Education Secretary), of journalism (as contributor to Methodist reviews and newspapers), of Conference (as pungent debater and manipulator of 'memorials'), Dr. Harrison was swept onward, with gathering momentum, to the Presidency and to death.

III THE DOCTRINE

Taine taught us in human investigation to look for *la faculté mattresse*, and to find the determining cause of a man's development in some event or emotional crisis of childhood. There is no doubt in my own mind that Dr. Harrison's chief characteristic was his hunger for *reality*; and that this realistic urge had its origin in the circumstances of his early life. His father's tragic breakdown early in his ministry (from which, though he lived until 1918, he never recovered), compelled his wife with three young children to seek a home with her parents in Castle Donington. The library (good for those days), was housed on shelves in a bedroom. Those books seemed to mourn the perpetual absence of their owner. They were a symbol of sorrow. A shadow lay upon the house. The family circumstances were straitened. Mother and children were, as we say, 'up against it' — not merely, or mainly, materially, but in spirit. Other disasters followed. The only daughter died at twenty of consumption — after a distressing illness. The career of the older son intensified family anxiety, and moved as if

by Fate to its calamitous end. What must have been the impact of such a series of events upon a sensitive mind? A weakling might have taken refuge in escapes — a theme for Thomas Hardy. But to a lad of Archie's character any sort of dodging through romantic back-doors was impossible. Out of that family of five, only the mother and her son remained. Unwilling to be a charge upon her, he realized that he must make his own way. Yet along the path of his mother's desire and his own growing resolve (the Methodist Ministry), there must be delay and the need for economy. And so, armed with native grit and a vivid sense of vocation, this youth fought his way through by circuit and battlefield, Didsbury and Westminster, to John Wesley's chair. Here is the clue to his formidable industry, his moral seriousness (sometimes verging on the ruthlessness), his scorn of dope and palliatives, his impatience with formalism and evasion. Here is the secret of his distaste for such conventional compromises as old-fashioned Anglicanism, sterilized (as he felt it to be) by its cult of gentility. For him life's challenges had been stark. He must have *reality* — above all, in religion. Propriety, tradition, æsthetic decorum, well-mannered reverence, did not go to the root. From the days of his youthful devotion to F. W. Robertson to his Conference address, his quest was to find 'primitive, real Christianity'. A paper of mine on *The Three R's of Methodism* — Reality, Rapture, Rule — won his approval, nor have I known one who better illustrated these three 'notes'.

In Wesley and the early Methodists he found the reality that he craved. They were living in the very heart of the Gospel. Their religion was not 'painted fire'. Those apostolic preachers were not 'professional Christians': they were men of God. They lived the New Testament over again. In their experience, Pauline metaphors leapt to life — 'servitude to sonship', 'bondage to liberty', 'darkness to light', 'death to life'. If such tests are not valid, if such mastery of life is rooted in illusion, where are we to look for the truth? His lifelong support of Methodist Union was rooted in this same passion for ultimates. Given unity in spiritual experience (the greatest thing of all), other disparities must be disregarded.

Methodism was his native air. He was immensely at home in the Church of his fathers — 'a double-dyed specimen', as I used irreverently to call him. On our tours he would always contrive to get a glimpse of the local Methodist chapel — and if it was Sunday, to attend at least the evening service. As much as any man, he lost the duty in the joy. This devotion was something more than ancestor-worship or a dogged protest against modernity. One of the most characteristic articles he ever wrote was a vindication of the Methodist type of public worship. Accustomed at Didsbury and elsewhere to the Anglican liturgy, and by no means impervious to its historical and literary virtue, he returned to a Methodist service like a man coming home.

What hymns were like the Wesley hymns with their massive themes, their personal poignancy, their martial music? What could be better than to open a service with 'Lo, God is here; let us adore,' or 'Leader of faithful souls'? Where else were to be found such melting tenderness, such urgency, such passion, such triumph amid life's tragedy and mystery? He was not above using 'the language of Canaan' — 'Where two or three are gathered together,' 'The House of God and the gate of Heaven', 'In my Father's house there is bread enough and to spare'; or well-worn lines from favourite hymns: 'Thy touch hath still its

ancient power', or 'Talk with us Lord, Thyself reveal'. With some men this sort of archaism is far from edifying. With him it was sincere and impressive. Few men had in equal measure his gift of public extemporaneous prayer. Good as were Quaker restraint and Anglican reverence, Methodist zest (rising to rapture) was best of all. The pilgrim strain touched him to the quick. Harassed by a sluggish constitution, confronting many spectres and sorrows, he would yet surge his way with strength renewed, marching joyously in step with those who seek the Promised Land and scale the Mount of God. Yes, given a passable specimen of its kind, the Methodist service remained his ideal. He entered into the characteristic Methodist 'means of grace' as to the manner born — prayer-meeting, class-meeting, love-feast; most of all he loved the Covenant Service. It was an inspiration on the part of his wife to print on his funeral hymn-sheet the sublime unflinching words of self-dedication, from that Service, which only a day or two before he had spoken for the last time.

On our Greek trip we had as a fellow-passenger Dr. Carnegie Simpson. Seeing him, I observed to my friend: 'There goes your Paraclete.' I had in mind his rapturous review of Carnegie Simpson's *Evangelical Church Catholic*. Never have I known him so enthusiastic about a book; 'John Wesley himself would have rejoiced at every page.' Could praise farther go!

The rustle of priestly robes was never a charming sound to my Puritan Protestant friend. Imagine, then, his delight at seeing Dr. Carnegie Simpson carry the war into the enemy's country, and prove that it is the Evangelical who is the real Catholic! Admirable formula! Anyhow, it expressed Dr. Harrison's convictions to a nicety. This is not the place to elaborate the argument. Suffice to say that, taking in order the doctrines of Salvation, of the Church, of the Priesthood, of the Holy Sacrament, of Public or Social Righteousness, Dr. Simpson argues with remarkable cogency that the Evangelical version of Christianity is not only the *truer*, but the *larger, wider* view. At its core the Evangelical view stood for the deep sense of personal allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ? All follows from this. The Evangelical experience is the very basis and meaning of the Catholic bond, which without the other is but an empty framework. Ecclesiastical order may construct a body for this fellowship (and a body is necessary in this world), but it cannot create its soul. The creative soul of it is Christ and the personal experience of Him on the part of all Christians as Saviour and Lord; so that he who is united to Him is *ipso facto* united to them also. As an Orthodox Patriarch put it: 'Where Jesus is, there is the bond.'

To make sure of doing justice to Dr. Harrison's convictions, I applied for guidance to his wife. 'It was Archie's way', she writes, 'to be astounded when outside people said we had no churchmanship. He believed we had discovered the secret better than they all, for it was ever his wont to prove it thus by Wesley's hymns, "Who thy mystic body are" . . . Methodism to Archie was central to everything; but not just Methodism with a label. What he meant by it was what John Wesley meant, and that was a company of people round their Captain, who had drunk deep of His spirit.' 'Names and sects and parties fall, Thou, O Christ, art all in all.' One of my friend's favourite sayings was: 'Where Christ is, there is the Church.' To him, therefore, the Christian minister was secondarily an officer of the Church; primarily he was a servant of Christ.

Here again we are back upon *Reality*.

So far as he had any watchword or programme for his Presidential campaign, it was to rekindle through the Connexion a sense of its priceless heritage and to recall it to its first love and its first works. To use Dr. Howard's words: 'that we should believe passionately in the Gospel of God's redeeming love, preach it enthusiastically and live it joyfully.' No man need desire a higher title than that of minister of Jesus Christ and of His evangel. On the name-plate of his coffin Dr. Harrison himself was described with challenging simplicity—*Methodist Preacher*.

Being a son of John Wesley, and not being a superfine person, he was a Patriot too. He had a broad and comprehensive vision, saw his country steadily, and saw it whole.

A facile cosmopolitanism, indifferent to the glories of England, moved him to disgust. The only men to achieve a better future for our country were those to whom her past was dear. Unrepentantly English, he loved her history, her countryside, her ancient monuments, her literature, her great men of thought and action. He had voluntarily drawn his sword in her defence. On his study wall hung fine portraits of Nelson and Walter Raleigh—and between them, one of the present writer. (Judge of the boundless partiality that could promote a friend to such high company.) Though it needn't end there, love begins at home. As boys we had learned masses of Milton. Later on, he found much to his liking in Milton's prose works. There is nothing squeamish about Milton's patriotism!

When God has some great work to be done, 'He gives it to one of His Englishmen'. 'Our national achievement is not beneath the reach of any point the highest that human capacity can soar to!' Our President really believed that an England Christianized would be the noblest work even of Almighty God. Nor would he, could he, write off this hope of a Christian England.

It was as Englishman as well as Methodist that he welcomed the opportunity to visit the U.S.A. After all, it was a Christian imperialist named John Wesley who did more than any other single man to repair the breach that George the Third and his ministers had made. As the political link was severed, Wesley was a foremost instrument in forging a new spiritual bond. I fancy Dr. Harrison's American trip felt like a visit to a great outlying parish in Wesley's world diocese.

My friend had, I must confess, a cult of Oliver Cromwell. Some ten years ago he published an article on 'The Constable of England' which gave him much satisfaction to write. His book, *Liberal Puritanism*, was dedicated to Mr. Isaac Foot, a perfervid Cromwellian. Lately, he found congenial employment in reviewing Mr. Foot's study of Cromwell and Abraham Lincoln. I will not attempt here to discuss the truth or otherwise of his views. One thing is fairly certain. He would have been one of Oliver's Captains. There would in fact have been *two* Harrisons in the charge at Naseby. Likely enough my friend would have cut me down; of course, in the name of the Lord of Hosts. Protestant, Puritan, Patriot, his name might well have appeared among the regicides. Truly, friendship has its trials! How many hours have we spent debating Oliver's character! When all is said and done, Cromwell is the symbol of the deepest, the most permanent cleavage in English life. Facing me now as I write is a letter from another friend, written on 30th January, with the heading: 'King Charles the Martyr.'

Like his wife, Dr. Harrison had a tender feeling toward what the French call *un exalté*. He loved the man of passion, the frequenter of prayer-meetings, the practical mystic moving inexorably toward fixed resolve and unflinching action. I had scant success in persuading my friend to revise his opinion of Charles the First, though more I am glad to say, in getting him to appreciate the merits of Charles the Second. On Cromwell he remained adamant. So I must leave him to John Wesley whose verdict on Sixtus the Fifth (one of the ablest of the Popes, though little addicted to sanctity) was: 'He was full as far from being a Christian as Henry the Eighth or Oliver Cromwell.'

Although in his youth Dr. Harrison burned a little Socialist incense, he remained at heart after all oscillations, a Victorian Liberal. His final political creed was *responsible individualism*. In his nature there was a deep strain of independence—an almost aggressive love of freedom. He was at home in *Galatians*. But he was careful to accept the responsibilities of freedom as well as its privileges. More than most men who claim rights, he remembered duties. *Responsible individualism*—the responsibility being primarily to God. The doctrine of 'stewardship' has fallen on evil days, but that is because men have lost the overwhelming sense of the reality and righteousness of God. Dr. Harrison came to see that the decay of Liberalism and the emergence of Socialism were due to the decline of religion. He believed, or tried to believe, that the religious eclipse was only temporary. Holding that the Methodist revival had touched and changed the heart of the English people, he hoped and prayed for another revival. The strident secularism of the age shocked and bewildered him. The swirling currents went rushing past him, leaving him high and dry with his religious emphasis and his Methodist apparatus. Men rudely dismissed his specialities as irrelevant. This surprised him. Did not the Apostles, did not Wesley, preach at a time when social and political wrongs were at least as rife as they are today? They were not ashamed of the Gospel, nor pushed aside as purveyors of dope. It therefore grieved him to see clergymen and ministers conniving at this current secularism and relegating religious interests to the background. With him spiritual interests were primary. That the church of John Wesley should drift and dwindle into an organization mainly preoccupied with social and economic problems seemed to him a selling of the pass. He could never agree that Moscow rather than Galilee was the spiritual headquarters of the world. A Socialist England was a poor substitute for a Christian England. No doubt it was the duty of Christians to be philanthropic and to inculcate justice; nor could it be denied that the cry of 'No politics' was sometimes raised by the devil. Otherworldliness could be a stepping-stone to this world. Nevertheless it was a dangerous dilution, indeed, a distortion, of Christianity to lay the chief emphasis upon the present world. Far beyond her mission and power to make this world endurable, the Church must rank her mission to make the other world real. It was one of my friend's deepest convictions (reiterated at Nottingham), that Christians had been most effective even for the Kingdom of God on earth when they had been most confident of the eternal Kingdom in the Heavens. He could not conceal his misgivings when he saw opportunist Christian leaders confessing in sporting language, that 'they had backed the wrong horse', and hurrying to rehabilitate themselves by professing a militant zeal for social reform. It was doing an injustice to Christianity and belittling the souls of men

to imagine that we shall gain the ear of the world by an economic gospel. Dr. Howard did not err when he declared at the Memorial Service in City Road, 'It was Dr. Harrison's deliberate judgement that Methodism took the wrong turn when it laid its supreme emphasis upon what was called the Social Gospel'. Let me endeavour to state his positive view.

The Church's fundamental mission is to spread religion, and all religion is personal. So narrow is the path to the mercy-seat that two cannot walk abreast. The modern tendency is to substitute for the struggle between good and evil in every individual, a struggle between good and evil in the nation as a whole. We live in an age obsessed by the collectivist idea. The popular cry (echoed by not a few Christian spokesmen) is, 'let us have good as a nation, and the individual will be good'. But Christianity has, from the days of Christ and his apostles, stressed the personal note. 'Except a man be born again?' Become good as individuals, and the nation you compose will necessarily be good. Secular reformers call for legislation, Christians for conversion. The individualist view is not exhaustive, but it is true and fundamental. The starkest individualism did make sure of the individual, but depersonalized socialism can make sure of nobody. We must not break the pivot on which everything turns. In the long run even the quality of our socialism is determined by the quality of our individualism. The millennium of secular reformers is an earthly one, and they are not to be blamed for desiring it. But that Christians should be stamped into this attempt to by-pass the personal factor is alarming. The present 'comfortable classes' may be dispossessed and supplanted by others: in such a change the Church is not interested. For it knows that progress will be the achievement of strenuous regenerated individuals, and not a mere consequence of general regulations for a spiritually lazy society. Much as my friend admired William Temple for his modesty, friendliness, humour, and equanimity, he realized the vulnerability of his politico-religious position. In a letter to me, written a year ago, he says: 'He (Dr. Temple) was definitely not evangelical and actually seemed to believe in making the world Christian without making Christians. I think you touch a really sensitive spot on that subject.' A Christian order must be worked by Christian men. Dr. Harrison was no apologist of the 'idle rich'. In spite of all my efforts he remained at bottom a democrat. One of his Didsbury letters (1905) quotes with approval Rendel Harris's dictum: 'The Christian religion will not hold caste in solution; it precipitates it to the bottom.' On the other hand, being a *Christian* democrat, he saw the absurdity of the present-day idealization of the 'working classes'. *Vox populi, vox Dei*, was a very leaky proposition.

To quote his Conference address once more — 'We need to go back to the centre and to remember what is our main concern. No doubt Methodism had more to do with showing the common man how to use his democratic privileges than any other force we can name. It is, however, the Gospel itself which must make the men and women before they become fit servants either of Church or State. So we come back to our primary business, exhorting sinners to return to God. God only renews the heart of man.' He was amazed when he found Methodist preachers more eager to talk economics and sociology than the Gospel. Certainly he did not thus slip his moorings. He and I often discussed history, literature, and politics — but he cared most to speak about the things

of God. It seemed to him that some of the younger generation, even of Methodists, had lost faith in the Gospel. For himself, his heart and his treasure were in religion:

Still nursing the unconquerable hope
Still clutching the inviolable shade.

And now he is gone. His exit has torn a great gap in many lives. I cannot but feel that he had premonitions of the end. Yet he had chosen his path and was the last man to retreat. He was ever a fighter and met his Waterloo with indomitable fortitude. Even those who will miss him most dare not regret his death in action. Who are we easier folk, who save our skins and prolong our days by keeping back part of the price, to question high devotion or to grudge its price? There is no test which tries so searchingly our faith in spiritual realities. Self-sacrifice may be reckoned grotesque megalomania — a man's taking himself and his concerns too seriously; or it may be taken as 'a filling out of that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ'. St. Thomas More held (and it was no academic decision) that 'A man may lose his head and come to no harm'. Is this 'heroic' — or is it only Christian? Archie Harrison served a Captain whose motto was not 'Safety First'.

His love preached out to every part,
And taught His fellows to atone,
And broke my heart and broke your heart,
And would not let Him die alone.

The servant is not above his Lord. He *would* live dangerously. The memorial in Shrewsbury School to those of its members who gave their lives in the Great War is a statue of Sir Philip Sidney (most illustrious son and patron-saint of the School). At the foot of the statue are the words: 'I recognize my brethren.' In their sacrifice they had followed in his train. There are chosen servants of God who can never shut their ears to Pascal's haunting cry: '*Jésus sera en agonie jusqu'à la fin du monde. Il ne faut pas dormir pendant ce temps-là.*' They have responded to the challenge of this perennial emergency. 'Wherefore He is not ashamed to call them His brethren.' More than forty years ago we were both reading R. L. Stevenson's *Virginibus Puerisque*. In a letter (January 1903) he picks out the essay '*Aes Triplex*' for special praise. '*"Aes Triplex"* is very fine — witness the closing passage [doubly underlined]. 'Here it is — "If men are suddenly tripped up and silenced, there is something splendid in such an ending. Better to live and work and be done with it, than to die lingeringly in the sick-room. The noise of the mallet and the chisel is scarcely quenched, the trumpets are hardly done blowing, when trailing with him clouds of glory, this happy-starred full-blooded spirit shoots into the spiritual land."' Fine to read at twenty; finer to fulfil at sixty-two.

As the funeral passed along 'The Baroon' (the quaintly-named road where he lived as a boy), it halted for a few moments outside the house that had been his home. A surge of memories swept over me. As I gazed at the little bedroom window I thought of the desk within at which he and I had spent so many hours reading Virgil:

Sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt.

The line is untranslatable, but its meaning is enshrined in those words from *John Inglesant*, so often quoted by Archie: 'Nothing but the Infinite Pity is sufficient for the infinite pathos of human life.'

He did not wear his heart on his sleeve; how tender and wistful a heart it was only his friends could know. This sturdy leader of ours could never forget the tears in the human lot. People wondered why a man apparently so virile, so steadfast, should so often choose 'Safe home, safe home in port'. It is not a jaunty strain; his victories were too hard-won. Those who want a clue to Archie Harrison's secret should attentively read through that hymn.

On his father's tombstone he placed the words *ex imaginibus in lucem*. 'Here we see as in a glass, darkly; but then, face to face.' 'And life's long shadows break in cloudless love.'

Archie has outsoared the shadow of our night. Life's mysteries cannot torture him now. After his toils and trapesings this soldier-pilgrim is in *patria*,

And hears the unexpressive nuptial Song,
In the blest Kingdoms meek of joy and love.
There entertain him all the Saints above
In solemn troops and sweet Societies
That sing, and singing in their glory move,
And wipe the tears for ever from his eyes.

F. BROMPTON HARVEY

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE METHODIST CHURCH IN THE TIME OF JOHN WESLEY¹

THE ITINERANCY

THE first Conference boldly declared that it was the design of God in raising up the Methodist Preachers 'to reform the nation, more particularly the Church; to spread scriptural holiness throughout the land'.² There were a few clergymen to help the Wesleys but very soon they were joined by enthusiastic laymen. Cennick at Kingswood preached to the colliers, but when Maxfield began to preach at the Foundery, Wesley had grave doubts about it all; but it was the Lord, and later Wesley gladly welcomed Lay Preachers and vigorously defended the practice. As these Preachers gave evidence of their ability they began to itinerate as did the Wesleys. This began in 1740, but its development was gradual; the clergy who were favourable to Wesley remained at work in their own parishes, but John Wesley undertook extensive tours and each year others joined him until the last Conference he conducted recorded the stations of 274 Preachers and fourteen Supernumeraries in the home work alone. There were three tests imposed on those 'who think they are moved by the Holy Ghost and called of God to preach': Do they know God, as a pardoning God? Have they the love of God? Do they desire nothing but God? Then their gifts were examined, their understanding, judgement, and speech.

¹ Continued from January number of this REVIEW (p. 40).

² *Minutes*, p. 9 (1744).

Finally inquiries were made concerning their fruit — 'Are any truly convinced of sin and converted to God by their preaching?'¹ In addition either Wesley or an Assistant heard the Candidates preach, and examined reasons why they thought God had called them; those converted by them being questioned; and the judgement of the Society in the particular place presented. Then came an appointment for one year as Probationers and they received the *Minutes*, a copy of the *Rules*, and were acknowledged as fellow-labourers.² The famous *Twelve Rules of a Helper* were drawn up by Wesley for these men. It was specially emphasized: 'It is your part to employ your time in the manner which we direct; partly in preaching, and visiting the flock from house to house; partly in reading, meditation, and prayer,'³ while 'You are not to ramble up and down, but to go where the Assistant directs, and there only.'⁴ On their reception into Full Connexion they were each asked a series of questions on their faith in Christ, the Methodist doctrine and rules especially on preaching and meeting the classes.⁵ In 1784 it was thought the time of trial of the Preachers was too short and it was decided, 'for the time to come, let them be on trial four years'.⁶

As the Preachers went about the country so did the number of the Societies increase. The Societies around one place were grouped together and formed a Circuit, and there was one Preacher in the Circuit who was in charge of all the Societies and the other Preachers. He was styled the Assistant. In 1749 there came about a general union of the Societies in England and in answer to the question: 'How can the state of all the Societies be known to the Stewards in London?' it was replied: 'By means of the Assistant.'⁷ At that time there were twenty Circuits; by the death of Wesley there were at least seventy in England alone. In these Circuits the Preachers moved from place to place, for Wesley declared that it hurt both Preachers and people for the Preacher to stay six or eight weeks together in one place. Though some Preachers left him because of it, Wesley maintained the itinerancy at all costs. By 1767 he ruled: 'The same Preacher shall not be sent, ordinarily above one, never above two years'⁸ in a Circuit, and his final arrangement was that no Preacher should labour in a Circuit more than three years.⁹ The duties of the Assistant were set forth in 1749 and included a quarterly visitation of the Classes and Bands and the holding of 'Quarterly meetings and therein diligently to inquire both into the spiritual and temporal state of each Society'.¹⁰ The Preachers themselves were not able to attend the meetings of every Society in the Circuit and so others called exhorters were granted a note of recommendation¹¹ by the Assistant and this was renewed yearly. These greatly assisted in the work and soon after the death of Wesley regular meetings of these 'Local Preachers' as they came to be known were held.

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

All the work of Methodism was initially carried on at little cost. At first the Preachers received no money although Wesley permitted them to receive gifts of food and clothing.¹² In 1749 it was found that many who would be Preachers

¹ *Minutes* pp. 29-30 (1746).² *ibid.*, p. 30 (1746).³ *ibid.*, p. 15 (1744).⁴ *ibid.*, p. 30 (1746).⁵ *ibid.*, p. 52 (1766).⁶ *ibid.*, p. 173 (1784).⁷ *ibid.*, p. 39 (1749).⁸ *ibid.*, p. 73 (1767).⁹ *New History*, I, p. 298.¹⁰ *Minutes*, p. 40 (1749).¹¹ *ibid.*, p. 30 (1746).¹² *New History*, I, p. 303.

were restrained because they had contracted debts and the Conference of that year debated how best they could secure these men. Then, further, many places in need of Preachers could not have them because they were not able to meet the expense. The solution to both these problems was the raising of a General Fund — 'By this means, those who willingly offer themselves, may travel through every part, where there are Societies or not, and stay wherever there is a call, without being burdensome to any.'¹ The money was to be contributed by every Society once a year and brought to the Conference. 'Two-thirds of it at least will be allotted for those public debts which call the loudest. The rest will be partly employed in setting at liberty such Local Preachers as are tied down by small debts; partly reserved for propagating the Gospel where there are none to bear the expenses of the Preacher.'² By this means the expenses were met and in 1752 a general allowance of £12 a year was made to the Preachers for necessities³ — although in 1769 it was stressed that the Circuits should provide 'horses, saddles, and bridles' for the Preachers 'cannot be supposed to buy them out of their little allowance.'⁴ In order to provide for the Supernumerary Preachers there was a Preachers' Fund to which each man paid ten shillings a year⁵ (later half a guinea).⁶

The Quarterly meeting was expected to provide for the married Preacher and the Assistant was expected to inquire 'what each Preacher's wife will want for the ensuing Quarter', and this was to be supplied first out of the common stock.⁷ This, however, led to much difficulty, for the *Minutes* of 1769 records the Circuits looked on married Preachers 'with an evil eye, because they cannot bear the burden of their families'.⁸ So a scheme was arranged whereby the wealthier Circuits were to help the Circuit near them where there was a deficiency 'till we can procure a General Steward for this fund'.⁹ 'By this means, whether the Preachers in any particular Circuit are married or single, it makes no difference, so that any Preacher may be sent into any Circuit without any difficulty.'¹⁰ Five years later, however, it was found that the married Preachers were much straitened and the Conference decided that every Preacher's wife with the exception of those at London or Bristol was to have £12 a year¹¹ and every Circuit was to provide a lodging, coal, and candles, or allow a further £15 a year.¹² In 1789 it was found necessary to address an appeal¹³ to the Societies, for some of the Circuits had complained of poverty, and the Preachers' wives there had to be supplied from the General Fund. So by one means or another until the death of John Wesley the wives received in cash or kind £27 a year wherever the Preachers were stationed. For the children Wesley had made careful provision. Kingswood School was established 'to ease the Preacher of the weight' of caring for his sons, 'wherein they have all the instruction they are capable of'.¹⁴ In order to keep the institution out of debt a collection was taken in every preaching house in England on 'the Sunday before or after Midsummer'.¹⁵ This was established in 1746 and thereafter one of the first questions of the Conference related to the Kingswood collection. It was not until 1774 that the daughters of the Preachers were

¹ *Minutes*, p. 44, par. 3 (1749).

² *Minutes*, p. 86 (1769).

³ *ibid.*, p. 43 (1749).

⁴ *ibid.*, p. 87 (1769).

⁵ *ibid.*, p. 211 (1788).

⁶ *ibid.*, p. 45 (1749).

⁷ *ibid.*, p. 45 (1749).

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 86 (1769).

⁹ *ibid.*, p. 115 (1774).

¹⁰ *ibid.*, p. 31 (1746).

¹¹ *New History*, I, p. 303.

¹² *ibid.*, p. 48 (1765).

¹³ *ibid.*, p. 87 (1769).

¹⁴ *ibid.*, p. 115 (1774).

¹⁵ *ibid.*, p. 32 (1746).

considered, and then it was recommended that they should be sent to M. Owen's school — 'perhaps the best boarding school for girls in Great Britain' — where they would be kept 'at as small an expense as possible'.¹

In conjunction with the increasing provision made for the needs of the Preachers it was ruled that no itinerant Preacher should follow a trade.² The Conference of 1768 considered the question in detail and found that the practice was both evil in itself, since it took up time that should be given to reading, exhortation, and teaching, and evil in its consequences, giving offence to many of the brethren. 'Therefore we advise our brethren, who have been concerned herein, to give up all, and attend to the one business.'³ Two years later the definite ruling was given: 'No Preacher who will not relinquish his trade . . . shall be considered as a travelling Preacher any longer', although it was quaintly added: 'We do not object to a Preacher's having a share in a ship'.⁴

The other outstanding financial arrangements concerned the building of preaching houses and their upkeep. The Foundery was the first place acquired for the use of the Methodists, and later in the same year the first erection was begun in the Horsefair at Bristol. Although this building rapidly came under the full control of Wesley, the first place to be built solely by Methodists was the Orphan House at Newcastle, in 1743.⁵ As the result of experience gained in the intervening years, Wesley produced in 1749 a mode of settlement for the chapels containing express provision for the control by Wesley of all who preached in them with the further condition that they 'preach no other doctrine than is contained in Mr. W.'s Notes upon the New Testament and four volumes of sermons'.⁶ No preaching house was to be begun without the advice of the Assistant,⁷ while through the General Fund⁸ the whole of Methodism contributed to the cost of any building. Nevertheless, the debt increased until in 1766 it was over eleven thousand pounds, so Wesley ruled that no further building was to be undertaken until two-thirds of the money was subscribed.⁹ Three years later he permitted the collections taken in any Circuit where there was a debt to be devoted entirely to the needs of that Circuit, and only the money received in debt-free Circuits was to go to the General Fund.¹⁰ In 1772 the method was changed, and now there was to be an Autumn collection and all the money sent to the Conference instead of the usual subscription.¹¹ The final ruling of Wesley was given in 1790: 'No collections shall be made in future for the building or repairing of preaching-houses, except in the Circuits where they are respectively built or repaired'.¹²

THE CONFERENCE

The first Conference was attended by six clergymen and four Lay Preachers. They came by direct invitation of Wesley himself; they took 'an especial care to set God always before them',¹³ desiring that 'all things be considered as in the immediate presence of God',¹⁴ and they discussed what and how to teach and what to do — 'how to regulate our doctrine, discipline, and practice'.¹⁵ A

¹ *Minutes*, p. 113 (1774).

² *ibid.*, p. 77 (1768).

³ *ibid.*, p. 78 (1768).

⁴ *ibid.*, p. 90 (1770).

⁵ *New History*, I, p. 291, footnote.

⁶ *Minutes*, p. 42 (1749).

⁷ *ibid.*, p. 41 (1749).

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 43 (1749).

⁹ *ibid.*, p. 55 (1766).

¹⁰ *ibid.*, p. 86 (1769).

¹¹ *ibid.*, p. 105 (1772).

¹² *ibid.*, p. 231 (1790).

¹³ *ibid.*, p. 4 (1744).

¹⁴ *ibid.*, p. 3 (1744).

¹⁵ *ibid.*, p. 4 (1744).

large proportion of the time at the first and several succeeding Conferences was devoted to establishing the theological background of the work. In addition, various details of the organization were discussed: field preaching, classes, the leaders, and the general conduct of the members. As the Movement grew so was more time spent on the organization, the *Rules*, and the financial arrangements. The Conference quickly became the decisive body of Methodism, establishing and shaping the organization whereby Methodism has been maintained. At it Wesley always presided, admitted and excluded the Preachers, appointed them to the places where they should work, and directed the whole economy. Membership of the Conference was not restricted to the Preachers, and in 1746 it was agreed that the most earnest and sensible of the Band Leaders where the Conference was meeting, and also any pious and judicious strangers who were there were also 'the properest persons to be present'.¹ Nevertheless, the Conference consisted only of those persons Wesley invited to confer with him.² As the scope of the Movement grew and time went by, Wesley became concerned that the Societies should remain united at his death. As long as he lived he was the centre where they should meet, and to preserve the Connexion at his death he suggested that all the Preachers should gather in London and draw up 'Articles of Agreement' and choose a committee to act in his stead.³ In order to lay a foundation for this, Wesley had the Preachers sign a declaration promising to devote themselves entirely to God, to preach the 'old Methodist doctrines and no other' and 'to observe and enforce the whole Methodist discipline'.⁴ This was drawn up in 1769, and signatures were added at the Conferences of 1773, 1774, and 1775. As the property of Methodism increased it became essential to define the Conference if only for legal purposes, to lay down the constitution and to provide for its continuity. This Wesley finally did in the Deed of Declaration and Establishment of the people called Methodists of 1784. Wesley chose a hundred men, 'being Preachers and expounders of God's holy Word, under the care and in connexion with the said John Wesley', to constitute the Conference.⁵ There was a sharp contention over the mode of selection of the hundred Preachers, and fears were expressed concerning the authority they might exercise. Wesley wrote beseeching the hundred not to take advantage of their position, and at his death it was 'unanimously resolved that all the Preachers who are in full connexion with them, shall enjoy every privilege that the members of the Conference enjoy'.⁶

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF METHODISM IN THE PERIOD

The main features of Methodism in the time of John Wesley have been outlined above and it remains now to mention briefly some of the general characteristics of the Movement. It was the most remarkable of the century, led by a man of peculiar genius aflame in the service of his Lord and bringing outstanding gifts both of preaching and of organization. Its fundamental stress was on the fellowship of Christians in the worship and service of Christ; it was ruled by the power of one man; and it bore peculiar relations to the Church of England.

¹ *New History*, I, p. 309.

² *ibid.*, pp. 88-9 (1769).

³ *Minutes*, p. 60 (1766).

⁴ *New History*, II, p. 553.

⁵ *ibid.*, p. 88 (1769).

⁶ *Minutes*, p. 234 (1791).

THE FELLOWSHIP

The life of Methodism was in the class meeting. Throughout the country each member of a Society was also a member of a class and counted it a privilege to meet each week with the other members, to tell them his trials and his joys, to receive the guidance of the Leader and the help and cheer of the members. The Leader cared for his members, was careful to note not only how each 'observes the outward rules, but how he grows in the knowledge and love of God'.¹ The meetings are in no sense an inquisition: they deal with the bodies and souls of men and women met together under God for their mutual help. The Leader is the friend and counsellor of all, and among the members as they pray with each other the true fellowship of the saints of God is brought into being. The classes together formed the Society, and as Wesley said: 'A society is no other than a company of men, having the form and seeking the power of godliness; united in order to pray together, to receive the Word of exhortation, and to watch over one another in love that they may help each other to work out their salvation.'²

THE POWER OF WESLEY

Dr. Rigg has described Methodism as 'an organization created and controlled by Wesley for the purpose of converting souls and of watching over converts. Wesley regarded himself as a sort of bishop'.³ His power over every aspect of the Movement was supreme. He ordered the classes and laid down the code of behaviour of the members, he ruled the Preachers, admitted them to the itinerancy, stationed them where he thought fit, governed both their theology and their habits; he controlled the preaching houses and regulated the finances — in short, there was no part of the structure of Methodism where Wesley's word was not law, and it was due largely to this power that Methodism survived.

In the Conference of 1766, Wesley set down the source and extent of this power. It began when others desired his guidance, and he had the power to appoint their meetings and to decide who should attend. Then Stewards became necessary, and these Wesley appointed — 'Let it be remarked, it was I myself, not the people, who chose these Stewards, and appointed to each the distinct work, wherein he was to help me, as long as I desired.'⁴ Likewise came the authority over the Preachers who laboured as he directed. The Conference assembled by invitation of Wesley — 'I myself sent for these, of my own free choice; and I sent for them to advise, not govern me.'⁵

The Deeds on which the Chapels were settled gave Wesley the power to appoint whoever he desired as Preachers. When the first place at Bristol was settled on eleven feoffees, and it became apparent that they could forbid Wesley himself to preach there, Wesley immediately cancelled the Deed 'and took the whole management of the building into his own hands'.⁶ He decided the type of building, that the windows should be sashed 'opening downwards', that there should be no tub pulpits and no backs to the seats.' Not only did Wesley decide the character and convictions of his Preachers, he advised them about their meals, forbidding them late suppers,⁷ ordered the length of their

¹ *Minutes*, p. 11 (1744).⁴ *Minutes*, p. 59 (1766).⁷ *Minutes*, p. 49 (1765).² Peirce, pp. 98-9.⁵ *ibid.*, p. 60 (1766).⁶ *ibid.*, p. 21 (1744).³ Rigg, pp. 65-6.⁶ Peirce, p. 607.

services,¹ warning them against 'lolling with the elbows',² screaming, or beating the Bible.³ It was this brilliant command of detail coupled with a wide vision of the whole scope of the Movement that enabled Wesley to create and expand Methodism until the day of his death.

RELATIONS WITH THE CHURCH

Finally we must note very briefly the relations of Methodism to the Church of England. Throughout his life Wesley belonged to the Church, 'and wished and urged his people as far as possible to attend her services and to take part in her communion'.⁴ His purpose was to reform the Church from within and the meetings he held were intended to be a supplement to the Church services and in no sense detached from them. He would not infringe on the regular afternoon service of the Church, but held early morning and evening services; 'he divided the morning service, taking the Litany as a separate service; he inculcated fasting and weekly communions'.⁵ Yet the enthusiasm of the Methodists, their habit of field preaching and the like, estranged the regular members of the Church, and it soon became apparent that a sharp divergence was inevitable. The first Conference was much exercised by the question and they claimed that they did not separate from the Church, for they 'constantly attended both the Word preached and the sacraments administered therein',⁶ and, while they believed that at the death of Wesley they would remain in the Church, they felt that, despite the fear that it might not be so, 'we cannot with a good conscience neglect the present opportunity of saving souls'.⁷ In 1749 the Conference gave the express direction to the Assistant to exhort 'all who were brought up in the Church, constantly to attend its service'⁸ and to set the example himself. Fearing a tendency toward separation, they went even farther and directed all the Preachers and all the people to attend constantly and 'to receive the sacrament at every opportunity'. Wesley would have no words used of Methodism which suggested it was a separate Movement. The members were warned 'against calling our Society a Church or the Church: against calling our Preachers ministers: our houses meeting-houses (call them plain preaching-houses)'.⁹ Thus he would not agree that they were Dissenters, for 'we do attend the Church at all opportunities' and 'we will not, we dare not separate from the Church',¹⁰ while in no sense were Methodist services intended to supersede the Church services.¹¹

As the work proceeded, and as the numbers increased, it became evident that despite his wishes, Wesley had begun a separate Movement. Three years before his death he acknowledged this — 'A kind of separation has already taken place, and will inevitably spread, though by slow degrees'.¹² The decisive break came when he began to ordain, and Bennett concluded that by that act he 'became actually in effect a schismatic'.¹³ Wesley claimed scriptural justification for this act, and when the needs of America became pressing his scruples vanished. In 1784, with the assistance of Coke and Creighton, he ordained two deacons and the following day he ordained the same men to be

¹ *Minutes*, p. 192 (1786).

² *ibid.*, p. 52 (1766).

³ *ibid.*, p. 192 (1786).

⁴ *Rigg*, p. 16.

⁵ *idem*, p. 29.

⁶ *Minutes*, p. 9 (1744).

⁷ *ibid.*, p. 9 (1744).

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 41 (1749).

⁹ *ibid.*, p. 41 (1749).

¹⁰ *ibid.*, p. 57 (1766).

¹¹ *ibid.*, p. 58 (1766).

¹² *New History*, I, p. 232.

¹³ *ibid.*, I, p. 230.

elders, and also ordained Coke to be Superintendent 'for the Church of God under our care in North America'.¹ Previously in 1769, and also in 1784, prior to the actual ordinations, Wesley had made provisions for the perpetuation of his work, and so with the ordinations, Methodism became firmly established as a separate and independent Movement.

This concludes the survey of 'The Organization of the Methodist Church in the time of John Wesley'. We have traced its rise from the Holy Club with four members, noted the real birth of the Movement with the conversion of John Wesley, its characteristic stress on fellowship, the details of the organization created whereby the whole country was covered by itinerant Preachers, and also the financial arrangements for the continuation of the work. At the death of Wesley there were over 120,000 members and many times this number were adherents.

Under God Wesley created Methodism and shaped its development, and at the end of his life it was a noble witness to the spiritual force and powers of organization that God had bestowed upon its leader. We can do no better than close this survey by quoting the words of the Conference of 1791, assembled after his death. They found themselves unable fittingly to express their feelings, but:

Their souls do truly mourn for their great loss; and they trust they shall give the most substantial proofs of their veneration for the memory of their most esteemed Father and Friend, by endeavouring, with great humility and diffidence, to follow and imitate him in doctrine, discipline, and life.²

AUTHORITIES IN FOOTNOTES

- Minutes: The Minutes of the Methodist Conference*, Volume I, 1744-98 (published in 1812).
New History: A New History of Methodism, Townsend, Workman, and Eays (2 volumes, 1909).
 Simon: *John Wesley and the Methodist Societies*, J. S. Simon (1923).
Rules: The Rules of the United Societies (1743).
Journal: The Journal of John Wesley, fifth edition (4 volumes).
 Peirce: *The Ecclesiastical Principles and Polity of the Wesleyan Methodists* (1868).
 Coke and Moore: *The Life of Wesley*, T. Coke and H. Moore (1792).
 Rigg: *The Churchmanship of John Wesley* (1886).

ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES

- Benjamin Gregory: *Scriptural Church Principles, etc.* (1888).
 J. S. Simon: *Summary of Methodist Law and Discipline* (1898).
 J. S. Simon: *Revival of Religion in England in the Eighteenth Century* (1907).
 Edwin Hatch: *Growth of Church Institutions* (1895).

NORMAN W. MUMFORD

THE CHURCH IN GERMANY: PAST AND PRESENT

DR. OTTO DIBELIUS, the present leader of the United Church in Central and Eastern Germany, expressed the true feeling of a steadfast minority when, early in 1926, he published his résumé of the great Stockholm Conference in the *Century of the Church* and provoked a strong dispute over the following proposal:

¹ *ibid.*, I, p. 231 (quoted from *Whatcoat's Journal*—Whatcoat was ordained deacon and then elder).

² *Minutes*, p. 234 (1791).

The Church shall provide her members with a form of life independent of that of the State. State frontiers cannot be Church frontiers. It is due to history and rather an imperfect heritage of Reformation times that, until 1918, political rules and limitations were considered to be identical with the principles of Church life in most of the Lutheran countries. Now the Church must shape the future according to the divine law and the Gospel of Christ.

When these sentences were written, the non-Roman majority of Germany was still divided into thirty separate territorial Churches. Neither those who had been to Stockholm, nor those who worked through the channels of the World Alliance for International Friendship and the Faith and Order Movement, extended their unifying influence much beyond the boundaries of the old Church in Prussia which was already a Union Church. In other provinces a pseudo-Lutheran self-consciousness, which tended to be rather negative and exclusively anti-Prussian, prevailed even at the late hour when churchmen and laymen of the north and east met at Barmen to denounce the first unification decree of the Reich government.

The formation of a Reich Church in 1933 was bound up with the introduction of the political leadership principle into the sphere of religion. Bavarians and Hanoverians stated that such a principle could only be enforced in territories where such a tradition as that of the east was at home. But though the Bishops, Dr. Meiser and Dr. Marahrens, had a better title to authority than Ludwig Müller, the Reich Bishop, whose influence on church administration was that of a chaplain to the German army, the Lutheran provinces were soon included in the domain of Dr. Jaeger who became State Church Commissioner in the summer of that fateful year, 1933.

Hitler, himself a Roman Catholic, appeared on the wireless as spokesman of the 'German Christian Faith Movement' on the eve of the general church elections (23rd July 1933). He fully ignored the resolutions of the synod held at Barmen only two months before. Hitler and his authoritarians had been brought up by people who called themselves Christians but did not realize that faith and creed had any bearing upon man's practical life and work. They had not been furnished with any idea of joint representations or brotherly efforts to attain a common aim.

It has been stated that the Fascist leadership principle was but a secularized form of Roman pseudo-theocracy. The Roman Catholic Church, however, stood aloof from the process of disintegrating religious life. By concluding a Concordat with Hitler and von Papen (8th July 1933) Pope Pius the Eleventh made his Bishops temporarily retire from the field of political action and reconsider their whole position. So the Catholics were the first to deepen the furrows and to cultivate the Christian land. On the other hand, it might have accelerated the rebirth of Christian liberty if the admirable Catholic Bishop of Münster, Philipp August Count of Galen, had been enabled to pursue his way of pastoral warning and friendly co-operation with the evangelical Martin Niemöller at an earlier date.

To say that Martin Niemöller has always been an evangelical and an ecumenical pastor, is not to deny that in his youth he had been a fighter. There is in Prussia a minority which traces its national tradition up to the times of the

medieval Eastland Company under which the first Order of Knighthood grew into a peaceful Christian Commonwealth. The essence of this has remained as an undercurrent, a part of that Little Germany which is, as Dr. Franz Hildebrandt recently stated, 'always in the minority and sometimes in the catacombs. But it has not only its tradition and history, it has its mission and future as well'.

With the might and help of God, the good fight of Christian believers against non-Christian militarists and totalitarian usurpers has been fought out in the provinces of Prussia. In the beginning there was no clear issue between Church and State; it was rather a struggle between two groups inside the Church. For just as (in the days of Frederick the Great) rationalism, secular enlightenment, and the admiration of human art had set aside the 'community' tradition of late medieval and Reformation times, so the message of the Bible, the homogeneous testimony of the Old and New Testaments, was now set aside by a 'modernized' conception of a deity in which Jesus Christ was nothing more than a Platonic idea. With this teaching about God the conceptions of right and justice were also teutonized. Pastors who did not proclaim what the authoritarians wished the people to hear, were either dismissed or imprisoned or killed. Two of the first martyrs were Pastor Schneider of Dickenschied and Dr. Weisler, a lay representative of the Barmen and Dahlem Synods and a keen supporter of the ecumenical movement.

Among the oppressed and persecuted, Aryan and non-Aryan, there sprung up an ecumenical church consciousness. Common distress gave birth to a feeling of common repentance before Him who divides his sheep from the goats. Common atonement was the root of a solidarity which broke through all earthly boundaries.

While the opposition Church government (created by the Dahlem Synod) had been recruited mainly from the north and east, the subsequent synods of Siegen, Augsburg, and Ulm were commissioned by the Bavarian and Württemberg Churches as well. It was the Bishop of Württemberg, Dr. Wurm, who won the confidence of the Berlin Dahlem Council of Brethren by his courageous protest against Dr. Goebbels' subtle methods for the annihilation of the Churches and by refraining from the monotonous and un-ecumenical habit of harping on old confessional formula and trying to rejuvenate a theology of the sixteenth century. By building a bridge to the minority in Prussia (so often suspected as crypto-Calvinist) Dr. Wurm, himself a friend of Pastor von Bodelschwingh, made the unity of the Evangelical Churches a reality, whereas the Reich Government had only attained the opposite in spite of its attempts to enforce a National Creed.

When Ludwig Müller had overdone his work of dissolution, he was silently dropped from the political arena. The ties which had attached religion to the Fascist State so very closely were severed, and the Church was pushed away as though into an inner chamber devoted to private meditation and ceremony. To the great number of Nazi officials and to all the Hitler Youth it was brought home that a private affair such as the isolated worship of the Christians was no business of theirs. The Church was to become an association of a few eccentrics and old people.

It has been said that Hitler built his house with the young and that the pastors maintained their churches by the help of the older generation. But further

development has revealed that the problem of Christian life and work is no part of any 'generation problem'. It is true that other extremists who, like Hitler, consider the Christian faith to be a private and, indeed, a secondary matter, have survived him. Even amongst Catholics the number of young people who understand the prophetic writings of men like Reinhold Schneider and Romano Guardini is still limited. But then the struggle of Christendom is not yet over. So far only one of the common enemies of Lutherans, Reformed Free Churchmen, and Catholics, has been frustrated. Germany will have no Christian majority until the feeling of common love and common responsibility is greater than the experience of common distress under Hitler and has lasted even longer.

The fact that Dr. Wurm is now the president of the German Council of Churches and Dr. Dibelius the head of the Berlin Church government is encouraging. But the Church does not live by its active leaders alone; it is also maintained by the martyred bearers of its testimony. To give an example — An essay on the Church in Germany would be a poor thing without the name of Dietrich Bonhöffer, one of the last victims of 1945.

By birth closely related to the nobility of the old conservative state, Dietrich Bonhöffer became a pacifist when Hitler rose to power. In his capacity as Central European representative on the Joint Ecumenical Youth Commission he attained a personal contact and brotherly friendship with such greatly different spokesmen of Christianity as C. F. Andrews, the Mahatma's interpreter, Bishop Ammundsen of Haderslev, Dr. Manfred Björkquist of Sigtuna, Dr. Karl Barth, the Professor of Bonn and Basle, and several leading Franciscans and Benedictines in Bavaria and Spain. He appealed to their charity and love, and he recognized the vital contributions they all had to bring to the future fellowship of the Holy Spirit. He was a churchman, a writer, and a poet. But he did not confine himself to theories. Continual meditation led him to realize that the domain of practical policy should also be conquered for Christ. In 1934 he led the German youth delegation to the World Alliance and Universal Christian Council meeting in Denmark, and he never forgot the Fanoe speech of his greatest friend, the Anglican Bishop of Chichester, containing these words:

It was said by a leading statesman when the first war began, 'the lamps have gone out all over Europe, and we shall not see them lit again in our lifetime'.

The lamps cannot be lit again as we should wish them lit, or new lamps take the place of the old, save through the kindling of a profound religious faith.

Dietrich Bonhöffer's surrender to the divine initiative, his faith in the undeviating righteousness of Him who created us to be his collaborators outweighed all his personal friendship with the optimists and pacifists who trusted in man's self-realization and the development of his inner light. When he managed to see the Bishop of Chichester again in 1942, he revealed that the group of churchmen for which he spoke was willing to co-operate actively with the restorers of liberty and justice in Germany. The story of that action has only recently been written.¹ The different anti-Fascist Church groups and their activities cannot be forgotten because Himmler, Hitler's executioner, made Dietrich Bonhöffer one of his last victims.

¹ See *The Contemporary Review* for October 1945.

Bonhöffer's message is that of the Church Universal. His victory is but a part of Christ's triumph, who 'must reign, till He has put all enemies under his feet'.

Death is still raging in the country; not only hunger and other envoys of physical death are having their natural harvest now, but there are also working the instruments of him which is able to destroy the soul.

The poisonous fruit of twelve years' nationalist propaganda is a general lack of confidence. The disillusionment of those who were never reached by the Gospel of Christ, leads its scepticism rather than devotion to the Bread of Life. Unless the Churches succeed in supplanting hopelessness by hope, revenge by forgiveness, and fear by love, the former chaplains of the racial creed will soon be the prophets of atheism. Unless the Churches take the consequences of the bitter lessons in Germany, unless Christians all over the world join in fervent prayer and faithful action to save the lost sheep, the destruction of body and soul will be irreparable.

The Confessional Church was for twelve years a Church in the desert. As it was necessarily mean in its appearance, the conception of the Church Universal became less exalted too. This is partly due to the fact that in the great northern field of the twelve years' struggle the Roman Catholic Church has also been a minority church.

Now the victorious minorities have both learned to realize that the Church should, in accordance with the universal character of God's will, urge its members to pray and work for a world order where there is freedom for the Christian life.

The nightmare of a State Creed has gone. Yet Christians who realize the living power of 'Bekennen' should not disentangle themselves from politics altogether. It would be a faulty apprehension of Catholicism which would again lend itself to a low conception of world order. All the faithful who have survived the twelve years of repression should disburden their consciences by clearly stating the issues of individual life in this world and by opening the doors to social transformation as well.

To all Christian communities, traditional and other, it is the lesson of Germany that only a faith which brings both individual and collective life within its sway can prevent the destruction of Europe's soul, and the triumph of secularism.

A PASTOR OF THE CONFESSIONAL CHURCH

SCOTT HOLLAND IN 1945

TWO men, above all others, won the confidence of a scared and doubting Edwardian England. Gore, it was felt, would pursue the findings of his supremely honest mind, if necessary, even to disbelief; and the fact that he continued to believe was the stay and support of many who were less qualified than he was to meet the intellectual opposition of scientists and textual critics. Gore, by the reasoned and ordered statement of his faith as a Christian, relieved the consciences of those who, while actually believing, felt that perhaps they ought to doubt. Scott Holland's great achievement lay in forcing those many

more who, whether lazily or unimaginatively, were following the fashion into doubt to recognize that really they believed. Gore was the thinker, Scott Holland the poet. Holland set himself to resolve the perplexing distinction between the faith which we hold and the scene in which it displays itself. His appeal was first of all to the imagination.

He was always perfectly clear, clearer sometimes than Gore, about the intellectual issues which were at stake. Early in his career he analysed the scientific habit of mind as 'the capacity to separate off for practical and theoretical purposes the secular from the spiritual interests of mankind, to study the chain of effects in all their complicated relations apart from their cause, to limit our considerations and calculations to that subordinate sphere in which their relation to God can afford to be omitted'. He saw, therefore, that science threatened no fundamental challenge to the premises of faith. So confident was he, that he was able to see even in the formidable doctrine of evolution only the final explosion of the deistic abstraction. The transcendentalist could no longer imagine a Being, remote, inscrutable, apathetic; the God of the twentieth century must also be immanent, restless, untiring, a Creator who moved and sparkled and perfected, showing daily the evidence of His master touch. And however familiar these ideas may be to us now, we can measure their force and originality at the time when they were uttered by the eager scorings and marginal comments with which our fathers, or perhaps we ourselves, used to mark his published works.

Holland's intellectual premises were sound and untroubled; but he never stooped, like Gore, to the detail of apology; for he believed that faith, the inward spiritual force, could never yield to any pressure from without, for it had its inward experiences and its inward facts. 'I am, God is,' these elemental announcements would, as he pleaded, start into life for anyone who dared to be true to the verdicts and convictions of his inner self. Faith must always be faith, an act of will, and will comes at no stage within the horizons of knowledge. 'Argue and discuss as we may, finally we must find ourselves facing a simple assertion "God said", over against which can always be heard the whisper of the serpent "Hath God indeed said?" And the assertion that we face is the assertion always of a man.' It was not for him to explain away little discrepancies in the Gospel texts, or to retouch the features of an historical Jesus, but to challenge the helplessness of unaided human nature with the Christian faith in its entirety; to brace the failing will and buttress the stunted imagination by examining the daily life of his own time, conditioned as it now was by technical progress, economic complexity, and centralized authority. And he painted this new world, of cities throbbing with the machinery of commerce, of growing and armed nationalism, of huge and disciplined and often oppressed labour forces, not with the faint disgust and utter hopelessness of the ordinary conservative ecclesiastic, but with a bold and vigorous sifting of its Christian potentialities, baring the superstition, establishing the fact.

In a sermon on speed, for instance, there are no deprecating references to 'the senseless hurry and bustle of this restless modern world'. He is in many ways genuinely delighted with it. It is the good servant of democracy. It leads to a wider distribution of commodities, it throws open the treasures of art and learning to the main multitude. 'You need not wait', he tells a band of Univer-

sity Extension Students, 'in your distant homes to listen to the echoes of what is doing at the high places where Wisdom holds her court.' They can come and know the wonders of her gracious industries. But, like all moral qualities, the intellectual insight and judgement which make the high discoveries will be slow in their formation. The great work will be done by the few, and they will always do it slowly. 'In a day of rapid diffusion we shall always be tempted to undervalue anything that cannot be turned to the obvious and immediate profit of great multitudes. Good as it is for many to be bettered, we cannot afford in moral matters to go without the very best.'

We are more sure of our ground now, almost complacent; but the breadth and balance of Holland's picture astonishes still. Most refreshing perhaps today is the breadth of his picture of man. For the popular dissemination of psychological dogma has led in our generation to an extraordinary depreciation of the human emotions. Scoffers now jibe, and successfully, at religion as a perversion of sex and at church-going as an emotional wallow. One would think that we hardly needed a William James or a Rudolf Otto to tell us that the highest human activities, whatever their real seat, are profoundly emotional, that Vision is inseparable from extreme emotional excitement, while the stirrings even of duty and conscience are at least emotionally disturbing. And yet this terror of 'Victorian sentiment' has spread even to the pulpits. The rational element of religion is over-emphasized — to the neglect of the moral element, for the human reason is seldom if ever a morally cogent force. Christian dogma, we are given to understand now, is really more sensible than it sounds; the doctrine of vicarious atonement or of the Trinity is really a very well-knit piece of logical reasoning. That was not Scott Holland's method. He was not afraid of mystery where definition was impossible. He was always referring to 'the secret recesses of self', the 'primary impulses', 'the germinal instincts'. Mysterious elements the emotions might be, but they were all-important and worked, as he believed, according to consistent and intelligible laws. 'That law', he said of vicarious suffering, 'which knits families into the blessedness of home, friends into the beauty of companionship, armies into the grace of chivalry, and nations into the splendour of patriotism. How can anything be more morally intelligible than for the stronger to give his strength to the weaker, than for the innocent to surrender his life-blood to shield and aid the fallen. This is the very instinct of all passion, the joy of all love, exactly what every human heart understands and every conscience justifies.' The virility is refreshing, the exuberance justified.

There is one aspect of Holland's thought which nowadays would attract suspicion. Whether the imprecision is of thought or of expression, he was apt to talk of the State in an almost totalitarian fashion. He never suspected, apparently, that a State could arise in which a minority lusting for power could succeed in dominating the very souls of their subjects, in order to lead them blindfold into an orgy of destruction. Perhaps he was in this respect guilty of the age-old error of arguing by analogy from the invisible to the visible world. 'Through the complete identification of its own lot with that of its fellows each individual is both lost and saved, lost in Adam, saved in Christ.' So far so good. Was it from this premise that he was arguing when he asserted that man's being frees and enlarges itself in a State, that 'the problem of man

versus the State has ceased if man is the State', that man's freedom and self-possession are 'braced and intensified by the recognition in himself of an inevitable national type'?

ROLAND OLIVER

Notes and Discussions

CONTINENTAL THEOLOGY AFTER THE WAR¹

SINCE the January number of this Review went to Press two fresh issues of the valuable Swiss periodical, *Theologische Zeitschrift*, have come to hand. Professor Karl Ludwig Schmidt is able to give further information, gathered from various sources, about the Theological Faculties in some German Universities in the four zones. This will supplement what was given in January.

In the Russian zone. (a) *Berlin*. E. Seeberg died in 1944 and E. Sellin in 1945 ('in Weimar versehentlich erschossen'). J. Behm, the well-known New Testament scholar, has been deposed. (b) At *Greifswald*, another famous New Testament scholar, E. Lohmeyer, is Rector of the University. (c) At *Halle*, amongst those deposed, are E. Barnikol and E. Fascher, so well known as the first prominent critic of Form Criticism and reviser of Jülicher's famous *New Testament Introduction*. But among those lecturing there we find the names of such distinguished experts as O. Eissfeldt (who is Rector of the University), E. Klostermann, and Julius Schniewind. (d) *Rostock*. It is sad to read the notice of F. Büchsel's death ('versehentlich erschossen').

In the English zone. (a) *Bonn*. Karl Barth, K. L. Schmidt, and F. Lieb have all been reinvented to their old chairs. Some lectures are to be given by some of them in the summer semester, but final answers have not yet been given. (b) *Göttingen*. Walter Bauer is ill. E. Hirsch has been pensioned. (c) *Kiel*. P. Meinhold and H.-D. Wendland are prisoners of war. H. Rendtorff is Dean. (d) *Hamburg*. The authorities of the English army of occupation are considering with favour the setting up of a Protestant Theological Faculty.

In the American zone. (a) *Erlangen*. P. Althaus is Rector. (b) *Giessen*. G. Bertram has been suspended. (c) *Heidelberg*. Th. Odenwald, the Professor of Systematic Theology, has been deposed. (d) *Marburg*. G. Wünsch has been deposed; Hans von Soden died not long ago. Bala (Dean), Benz, Bultmann, H. Frick, Maurer, Uckeley are lecturing. Hermelink's return is still uncertain. Heiler belongs (as before) to the Faculty of Philosophy. (e) *Frankfurt am Main*. A Protestant Faculty of Theology has been planned. Erich Foerster, at one time for many years Professor of the History of Religion and of Church History, died recently.

In the French zone. *Tübingen*. G. Kittel has been deposed. Lectures are being given by O. Bauernfeind, K. Fezer, A. Kobërle (Dean), O. Michel, R. Paulus, Y. Rückert, M. Schlunk, Thielicke, W. Völker, G. Wehrung, A. Weiser, and Würthwein.

W. F. HOWARD

BRITISH COUNCIL OF CHURCHES CAMBRIDGE CONFERENCE ON EVANGELISM

At his Enthronement the late Archbishop of Canterbury declared that the most significant movement in modern Christendom had been the outworking of the Ecumenical idea among the Churches. The great conferences at Edinburgh,

¹ See LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW, January 1946, p. 1.

Lausanne, Oxford, Amsterdam, and Tamburam have been so many sign-posts along that road. Now the individual Christian as he looks beyond his own communion moves easily to the thought of the British Council of Churches and from that to the World Council of Churches.

It is in line with this development of Christian thought and practice that an inter-church conference on Evangelism was held at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, on 2nd-5th January under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury. It is difficult to find any parallel in English Church history for so notable a gathering. And it is not unkind to say that the fact of the gathering was greater than anything that immediately proceeded from it. There were representatives from the Scottish, Welsh, and Irish Churches as well as from the Free Churches and the Church of England. The Methodist representatives were the Revs. Colin Roberts, J. K. Whitehead, Eric Baker, and Maldwyn Edwards. Another Methodist, the Rev. H. T. Wigley, attended in his capacity as Secretary of the National Free Church Council, and Dr. Flew and the Rev. E. C. Urwin were present as Chairmen of the Council's Departments of Faith and Order, and Social Responsibility, respectively.

Certain lively impressions still remain. Throughout the Conference there was an excellent spirit of fellowship and some of the conversations at table were in their way as valuable as the more formal discussions in the Lecture Hall. As can be well imagined, the Methodist representatives inevitably gravitated together and, on one particular night — encouraged by the warmth of a blazing fire — they sat on into the still, small hours talking over the affairs of the beloved Church. Another impression that is not modified by afterthought is that whilst the opening talks were generally on a high level, the stimulating part of the Conference came from the floor of the house in the give and take of general discussion. Now and again there were those who did not overcome the temptation to talk at greater length than their theme demanded. But on the whole people rose from a sense of urgency and with the desire to make a definite contribution. It is a very strange but significant fact that the Conference did not follow at all the carefully laid-out programme. Our most approachable, genial, and altogether friendly Chairman pointed this out to the Conference at the end of each day. As a matter of fact, had his Grace desired to rule us with a sterner discipline, he could doubtless have kept the conversation more strictly to the laid-out plan, but his tolerance may have been due to his desire that the wind should 'blow where it listeth'. The Spirit of God moving in an assembly never takes a predictable course.

Each day one particular phrase seemed to be a focus for conversation. On the first day Mr. Edwin Barker, of the Y.M.C.A., in speaking of the service of his organization, spoke of the 'tea and buns' given, not with any proselytizing motive but because men were hungry. Out of this, the Conference came to feel that whilst such practical service is not direct evangelism, such forms of service are the means by which we witness to the Faith we have received.

On the second day, following Dr. Flew's introductory address on that area of Faith which is common to all the Churches, Dr. J. H. Oldham started a hare by asking how we should address ourselves to the engineer in such terms as he could understand. In subsequent discussion there were those who felt that the engineer (typifying modern man in bondage to science) could be reached by a recognition of the fact that, *au fond*, he is a human being subject to cold and hunger, a creature of fears and hates and loves. Secondly, he can be reached by showing the relevance of the Gospel to the world in which he lives his daily life; that implies expression of the Gospel in social terms. Thirdly, he can be reached by realizing that despite his technical language and scientific attitude he is still unable to answer the fundamental questions of life apart from the aid of religion. Whether he recognizes it or not, he

is a child of God, needing God's power and direction and presence in the business of his life. There is no doubt, however, that when the conversation had run its course, the Conference still felt that the last word had not been said and that the Church had not found as yet the right technique for making the Gospel intelligible and 'biting' to modern man.

On the third day of the Conference the phrase that fastened on the minds of those present was used by the Bishop of Worcester in a stirring appeal for the Churches to unite in a campaign of evangelism. He asked that while remaining true to our separate interpretations of the Faith, we should declare 'a truce of God' on controversial issues and concentrate on those things we have in common. There were some who understood this to mean that we should not raise any issues that might lead to contention, even though we felt that there was need on occasion to express such convictions. It was evident, however, that the Bishop only meant that whilst being entirely loyal to our separate witness, we should not remain within separate camps but give substance to the line of the hymn: 'Like a mighty army moves the Church of God.'

It is satisfying to be able to report that before the Conference came to its close on Friday night it was agreed that the Churches should be summoned to unite in a great enterprise of Christian witness and evangelism. This did not mean that any one method would be adopted, but in the use of several methods, the same call should be sounded and the same appeal pressed home to the consciences of the British people. To that end a committee of the British Council of Churches will consider what further steps ought to be taken and the whole matter will be referred to the April meetings of the whole Council. If the British Council of Churches should be favourable to the recommendations of the Cambridge Conference, an invitation will be sent to all the constituent Churches inviting their co-operation in so urgent and mighty a task. The trumpet has sounded — let us prepare ourselves for battle!

MALDWYN EDWARDS

A. G. GARDINER: A GREAT EDITOR

THE recent death of A. G. Gardiner emphasizes the impoverishment of British public life through the passing of the editor who is also a writer. Journalism in England has suffered immeasurably from changes that have revolutionized newspaper management. The encroachment of business methods — in which the piling up of profits has precedence over the leading of enlightened opinion — upon the domain of letters has tended to edge the literary man out of the editorial chair.

A. G. Gardiner was a writing editor. His peers were J. L. Garvin of the *Observer*, H. W. Massingham of the *Daily Chronicle*, C. P. Scott of the *Manchester Guardian*, and J. A. Spender of the *Westminster Gazette*. Like them, he was trained in the provinces. Most successful London journalists have come up to Fleet Street from the country, though usually not as late in life as A.G.G., who was thirty-seven when George Cadbury, having bought the *Daily News*, brought him from the comparative obscurity of Lancashire to edit it.

Born at Chelmsford, he went straight from school to the *Essex County Chronicle*, and after a period on a Bournemouth newspaper joined the staff of the *Northern Daily Telegraph* at Blackburn. There his gifts were recognized. He was appointed leader writer and, later, editor of the weekly edition. The proprietor was Ritzema, an enthusiastic Liberal, who eventually took over the management of the *Daily News*, which had run into difficulties by opposing the Boer War; and, realizing that only a man of unusual temperament and skill could retrieve its fortunes — and that the

skill required was literary rather than commercial — Ritzema recommended Cadbury to send for Gardiner. Hence in 1902, when the paper's fortunes were at the ebb, the man from the North', concealing his misgivings, stepped on to the Bouverie Street bridge.

The appointment was aptly described as a bold stroke. Gardiner, unknown in the Street of Ink (whose denizens are not always as well informed as they like to think), was foredoomed to failure by those who imagined that no good thing could come out of Blackburn. But the prophets were confounded. Gardiner displayed qualities of character and ability that surprised even those who thought they knew him. It is true that his task was lightened by the healing of the wounds mutually inflicted by Liberals in the heat of war-time disagreement, and that the paper profited by the unexpected return of the Liberal Party to power under Campbell-Bannerman and Asquith; but those fortuitous events could not of themselves sustain him in his chair for a longer term than any other editor of the *Daily News*. It is true that, as so often happens, the occasion found the man; it is not true that, as so often is supposed, the occasion *made* the man. It never does, and never can: all it can do is to draw out, and provide opportunity for, latent gifts that hitherto had not found a suitable employment.

Gardiner was a convinced and courageous Radical. Deep in his nature lay the roots of a fearless idealism which recognized the need for the great social changes enacted by the Liberal Governments of the next decade. He had not a little to do with their enactment. Consistently and persuasively he popularized Lloyd George's schemes for improving the lot of the poor, and in 1908, by sponsoring the Sweated Industries Exhibition, he did much to awaken the nation's conscience to scandals that should never have been tolerated. There were those who, characteristically uncharitable, proclaimed it to be a stunt. Undoubtedly Gardiner knew that the exhibition would publicize his paper: he was as shrewd as he was enterprising; but his radicalism was genuine and sincere, and his chief concern was to strike at exploitation. As his friend and colleague, Robert Lynd, has said of him, 'Liberalism was in his bones'. It 'was to him not a matter of politics but an inheritance handed down by great spirits of the past'. He hated injustice, and championed the unprivileged — not only in theory but in the day-by-day handling of affairs in his own office.

All that, however, splendid as it was, would not have made him a great editor. In addition, he was a master of newspaper craft. No Olympian, remote and aloof, he knew at first-hand the practical necessities of daily newspaper production. Having been a reporter and a sub-editor himself, he appreciated both the difficulties and the obligations of those who worked under him. Moreover, he had imagination — and a deep knowledge of the hearts of men. Not the least quality demanded of an editor is the capacity to weld into a united team a group of individualists. Gardiner attracted to his paper some of the most talented journalists of his day, including H. N. Brailsford, R. C. K. Ensor, J. L. Hammond, H. W. Massingham, C. F. G. Masterman, and H. W. Nevinson. They could not have been an easy team; but Gardiner, as captain, held their allegiance. He even introduced into the team that most incalculable of all modern individualists, G. K. Chesterton, without upsetting the balance. No wonder his friend, J. A. Spender, wrote to him (in 1940): 'You and I have had a pretty good innings at the heart of things . . . but you have the touch of genius. . . .'

That touch of genius is to be seen in the work that made his second reputation. His character sketches of public men and women did as much as Chesterton's provocative essays to commend the *Daily News* to the thinking public. Few contributions to daily journalism have as successfully endured the tests of republication. Collected in *Prophets, Priests, and Kings* and *Certain People of Importance*, they remain models of

a difficult art. No writer of his day was more adept at exposing in a thousand words the hidden character of the sitter. His vignettes of such very different people as Dean Inge and Bernard Shaw, Lady Astor and Miss Maude Royden, J. M. Barrie and Arnold Bennett, Henry Ford and J. M. Keynes, while of necessity undetailed, remain after many years recognizable and revealing. Not content with this further success he wrote for the *Star*, as 'Alpha of the Plough', those delightful essays on life's well-considered trifles which charmed a multitude of readers when they appeared in book form.

The real A. G. Gardiner was an amalgam of A.G.G. and 'Alpha of the Plough'. The imagination and insight which enabled him to pierce the armour of celebrities and the art with which he wrote of simple things, also enabled him to maintain a purposeful unity among the teasing diversities of his famous *Daily News* team. The integrity of the idealist and the faith of the Christian humanist combined in him to uphold the highest traditions of the Press. He was a great and independent journalist whose like is rarely seen, and he served his generation nobly and well.

R. G. BURNETT.

NOT BY BREAD ALONE

EVERYONE is familiar with our Lord's quotation of Scripture in rebuttal of the tempter's appeal to the promptings of natural appetite, but the English version of the passage (Matthew iv. 4; Luke iv. 4) does less than justice to the full significance of the original (Deuteronomy viii. 3). The phrase 'every word that proceedeth' has led many to a too literal and limited application of the ancient wisdom. The R.V. rendering of the Old Testament text, 'every thing that proceedeth', approaches nearer the meaning, which an eminent Hebrew scholar defines more closely as 'every outgoing'. The 'thing spoken' includes more than the recorded words of Holy Writ; it comprises all the means and media by which God reveals and communicates Himself to men. Not on the gratifying of natural appetites can man truly live, but only, as Dr. Weymouth interpretatively translates, 'on whatsoever God shall appoint'. He cannot attain to the full stature of manhood by material satisfactions alone. Spiritual sustenance, 'manna from above', is essential to his soul's growth. Only as he is receptive to 'every outgoing' of God toward him can man fulfil his divine destiny, and rise from a creature of earth to become an heir of immortality.

'Men of earthly mind', glorying in the pursuit and satisfaction of worldly desire, find their account in this life, and have no promise of anything beyond. Jesus came to lift men above the business of existing, and to teach them the art of living. He sought to deliver them from the dominion of the animal nature, whose fate is destruction, and to inspire them to live the life of the Spirit, which leads to life eternal. Daily bread is necessary, and He taught men to pray for it. But they are not to be so engrossed in labour for the food which perishes that they miss the living bread 'out of heaven', which gives life for evermore. The mysterious manna in the desert satisfied the bodily hunger of the eaters, and they died. Jesus, the Bread of life, supplies the soul with the food of immortality. The Body broken in love and sacrifice for men is become 'the life of the world', on which man must feed in his heart by faith, if he would truly live.

A sign of the growing awareness of the truth of these things is the announcement in these latter days of 'the end of economic man', that fabulous figure which once haunted the minds of political economists. Work and wages, food and shelter, and all the other things requisite and necessary for the body, are important and must be supplied. But they are not 'the be-all and the end-all here'. Man has a spirit, is a spirit. Let him gratify all the passions of the flesh, satisfy all the appetites of his

physical frame, he still is not fully content, not perfectly happy, not wholly man. He is conscious of instincts, questionings, stirrings of the spirit, 'weary longings and yearnings for the mystical better things', for which material benefits are no solatium. Money and security, a decent home and a regular job, are necessary to man's existence, but to live as one 'born for immortality' needs more than these. In *Night over Europe* Frederick Schuman says: 'Man never lives by bread alone. He needs love and confidence in his fellows. He needs hope and assurance in his way of life, whatever it may be. He needs religion, secular or ecclesiastical. He needs devotion to social values which have meaning in his daily toil.' In other words, man needs faith, fellowship, worship, all that gives purpose and dignity to his life and labour. These are all 'goods' of the mind and soul, more to be desired than much goods in barns and banks.

William Blake's oft-quoted words have found tragic confirmation in the events of our time: 'Man must and will have some religion; if he has not the religion of Jesus, he will have the religion of Satan, calling the prince of this world "God", and destroying all who do not worship Satan under the name of God.' The horrors of Nazi Germany are a monitory comment on that prophetic utterance. The established Churches had failed to capture the allegiance of the mass of the people; the absorption of the political parties in material aims made no appeal to the idealism of youth, and kindled no flame of devotion in any heart. There was no spiritual vision, no religious outlook on life, no faith and hope to assure a brighter and happier future. But 'man must have some religion', and the prophets of false gods found a fruitful field in that spiritual vacuum. Primitive and pagan though it was, the new faith won millions of willing devotees. The old tribal heroes, the glory of the warrior and the sublimity of war, the surpassing greatness and power of the State, surrender to the absolute rule of the Leader, these things became the ingredients of a thrilling and authoritative religion. That it was all utterly romantic and irrational mattered not at all. The desire for faith and fellowship and worship was satisfied in service and sacrifice for the Fatherland and the Fuehrer. Man felt himself no longer alone, the most desolating of human conditions. He had found a comradeship of service; he had seen a gleam to follow, a crusade which made demands on his capacity for adventure, valour, obedience, sacrifice. It was a knight's quest, which might have led the world to noble ends had it not been perverted to hideous and horrible purposes.

In this modern instance of man's need of religion, and of the impossibility of secular politics replacing religion without disastrous consequences, we have a warning of great moment for our day and generation. 'It can't happen here' is a phrase which only the blind and foolish can take to their comfort. Many years ago Dr. George Jackson used the ominous words, 'the slow departure of the thought of God', to describe what was happening in England. Can it be honestly averred that the thought of God is any more real and present today? Does His will prevail in public life? Do all the people, or even most of the people, honour Him by their worship and service? Is it the national policy and aim to seek first His kingdom and obey His righteous rule? He would be a bold man who declared that God is over all and in all, the beginning and the end, of our country's doings, or that spiritual things are uppermost in the individual lives of its citizens. Signs are not wanting of a still further departure from the thoughts and ways of God. In Miss Amy Buller's book, *Darkness over Germany*, she quotes an Austrian priest as saying:

[In England] there has not been the same aggressive attack on a spiritual conception of life, but the drift into a purely secular form of life is there, and even among educationists and social reformers there are many assumptions based on a humanist and not a spiritual conception of the world. If that trend is not challenged then in time men in your country, too, will make themselves false gods.

We proudly boast that never could Christian England become like Nazi Germany. And we sincerely believe it. But what if England be not Christian? What if God be forgotten? What if the divine ideals of service and suffering and sacrifice for others' sakes are overlaid and stifled by the more personal desire for security and comfort? What guarantee have we that when men have won all the benefits that this world can give, they will rest in happy and peaceful content? The world gained, but the soul empty, is the devil's opportunity. False gods, false glory, false good, after these men goes seeking when he forsakes the true God and worships at other altars. It is not to be denied that the symptoms of spiritual decline were increasingly marked in the years between the wars. Amusements and sports, all kinds of 'fun and games' of sometimes dubious propriety, and more doubtful profit, filled the leisure hours of masses of the people. To make money and multiply possessions was the hope and aim of most. The most popular deity was the 'Goddess of Getting On', as Ruskin called her, and a man's success was measured by his acquisitions. Mechanical invention produced marvellous results; technical and scientific advance was prodigious; but all the same the world rushed nearer and nearer to the abyss, and civilization came nigh to destruction.

Bread and circuses! Peace and plenty! Man cannot live by these alone. He may feed full on this world's good things, but if his soul is starved he becomes like the beasts that perish. Mr. C. A. Richardson, in his *Strategy of Living*, says: 'If there is nothing in our experience except what is associated with bodily life, existence would seem to be pointless, incomplete and incomprehensible, and certainly incompatible with belief in God.' Without God — without hope! The twain are inseparably joined together. Where the spiritual vision is dim, and the soul's vitality low, the ascent of man is stayed, his forward march halted. His dreams and desires are bounded by the material and the mortal. 'Tomorrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant.' To live so is stagnation, sterility, bequeathing nothing from our hands with 'power to live, and act, and serve the future hour'. As Berdyaev has said: 'Only the spiritual man, striking his roots deep in infinite and eternal life, can be a true creator.' Only when man's spirit is quickened and 'touched to fine issues' by the Divine Spirit can he see the things that are true and beautiful and good, and build a noble society, a holy city, or anything else lovely and lasting. 'Shall we explain Westminster Abbey by the brick-yard?' asks Dr. Stanley Cook, in *The Rebirth of Christianity*. 'We analyse and discover that we are entirely conditioned or determined by the potentiality of the cells, the chemical elements, and the atoms; and in the last resort the course of Nature and Man seems to be determined by the laws of physics. Hence comes our fear lest this sort of Materialism should give a secondary place to spirit, and imprison us within an impersonal process.' But the kingdom of God, the Divine Order, is not 'determined by the laws of physics'. The new earth, wherein righteousness shall have its home, will not be founded on material conditions, but on spiritual convictions. The spiritual basis of society is infinitely more important, and more enduring, than its social and economic arrangements. Concentration on what has been called 'bread and butter economics', planning for social security, and all the political programmes for the betterment of the human lot, the *external* standards of living, may result in producing only, what Dr. Joad has called, a 'Society of happy pigs'. A clean sty and a full trough! Is that all man requires? Would that suffice to make an earthly paradise?

'The real science of political economy', said John Ruskin, 'is that which teaches nations to desire and labour for the things that lead to life; and which teaches them to scorn and destroy the things that lead to destruction.' If that had been the motive and aim of its professors, it would not have been branded by Carlyle as the 'dismal science'. But Ruskin looked at economics in the light of the Bible and of Christ. A science concerned only with the production and distribution of material wealth, 'the

bread that perisheth', could not guide men into the way of true contentment and happiness. Quite other are 'the things that lead to life'. Absorption in material benefits, the seeking after earthly rewards and possessions, must 'lead to destruction'. For the struggle for worldly 'goods' makes for separation, competition, strife. It is in the realm of the spirit that mankind must find the sure foundations of unity and peace and fullness of life. In his *Christianity and Economics*, published just before the outbreak of World War II, the late Lord Stamp wrote these prophetic words:

For we know in our bones that a complicated pagan world, built on selfishness, will destroy itself by becoming unmanageable, and go down in a cataclysm of political muddle and force, if it does not succumb to military chaos. It is only by ethical tensions and regulations that a complex world can endure. It seems that the task of the spirit is not to abolish poverty, or become hoarse over it, but to abolish spiritual poverty in order to make life more abundant.

'For the mind to be given up to earthly things means death; but for it to be given up to spiritual things means life and peace.' St. Paul's words ring out like a tocsin to the peoples of the world today. The choice between 'the interests of the flesh' and 'the interests of the spirit' is the test and temptation by which mankind is continually being tried. On the choice depends the good or ill, the life or death, of the race. Jesus showed the world the way out of mere existence on the animal and material level, which must end in destruction, into abundant and inexhaustible life, a way of life in harmony with the eternal purpose. At the Malvern Conference, the Rev. W. G. Peck said: 'The life of man in the natural order, with all its economic requirements, is intended to minister to his life as a spiritual being, created for the end of divine communion.' To allow the means of living to obscure the end of life is to tread the downward path to disaster. Only 'on whatsoever God shall appoint', on 'every outgoing' of God, shall man live. 'This is life eternal, that they should know thee, the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ.'

F. HAROLD BUSS

GROUP STUDY FOR LOCAL PREACHERS

PEOPLE have made inquiries about the classes which have been held in various districts for the training of local preachers and other lay leaders in the Church during the last six years. They have asked: What text books do you use? What are your methods of teaching? What kind of results do you get? It is not easy to describe these Study Groups, but I will do my best.

It was during the four years spent in South Wales in the dark period of unemployment that I discovered how responsive men could be when one shared with them the best things that come as a result of a specialized study of the Bible. Many unemployed local preachers were eager students, with keen minds, and they used their time fruitfully. They sat round a refectory table, listened, took notes, answered questions, contributed to the discussion. A class that met on Monday afternoons was christened 'The School of the Prophets'. So my apprenticeship as a tutor began in South Wales. In 1939 the Local Preachers' Department opened to me a door for the extension of this group work. Since then classes have been held in Derbyshire, Lincolnshire, Bedfordshire, Somerset, and Yorkshire.

First, let me say a word about the personnel of the groups. Members are recruited from various churches in the district. Some are experienced local preachers, others 'on trial' or 'on note'; some are teachers of Sunday School Departments; others are not committed to any service in the Church. In every group we have a mixed company of people, who vary in capacity and experience. Almost every trade and

profession is represented; shopkeepers, farmers, miners, graduates, civil servants, teachers, bank clerks, railwaymen, probation officers, factory workers, and so on.

It needs a little skill, and careful planning to arrange a syllabus for such a group so that the needs of every member will be met. The course for a year includes:

The Study of St. Mark's Gospel;

St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, especially the eighth chapter where the great

Methodist doctrines emerge;

A short course in Homiletics;

Practical out-workings in team-service.

We use *St. Mark's Life of Jesus* by T. H. Robinson and *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* by C. H. Dodd for our text books, and some of the Fellowship Manuals for Special Subjects, e.g. *The Eighth Chapter of Romans* by W. R. Maltby. But what proves to be the most challenging, provocative, and inspiring work is the study of the text of the New Testament itself. We wrestle with great themes and passages until they have yielded their content. Our concern is to understand 'the mind which was in Christ Jesus'. There are outstanding events in the life of our Lord over which we pause. For instance, as we move toward the story of Peter's Confession at Caesarea Philippi we are aware of the coming crisis in the life and ministry of Jesus. As a preparation for this we take three weeks to work through the passages in the Bible which refer to 'The Son of Man', 'The Son of God', and 'The Messiah', tracing the development of the conceptions which are associated with these pregnant names. One valuable result is a deeper understanding of the continuity of the purpose of God as we trace it in the revelation vouchsafed in the past and brought to consummation in the Word 'made flesh'.

Every group member would say that the questions are a great feature in our Corporate Study. Some questions deal with definition of such terms as 'The Kingdom of God', or with such key-words as 'repentance', 'faith', 'grace', and 'justification'. Others deal with the exposition of passages in relation to their context — an excellent discipline for a preacher whose temptation it is to use a text as a peg on which to hang a few ideas of his own. Other questions are designed to help the student to do a little digging on his own account, to develop his powers of imagination, or to quicken his critical faculty. All the answers are shared with the group, and frequently the highlight of a meeting has been in the discussion time when members report their findings.

By the time a group has worked through a Gospel which culminates in the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord, it has become a disciplined company, unified in spirit and life. The early chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, with their vivid narratives of Pentecost and the life of the early Church, is a good introduction to the next stage in our studies. Members who have professed to have no interest in theology find that in approaching this subject from a new angle it is not only of absorbing interest but vitally related to life and experience. In St. Paul's epistle to the Romans, for instance, they discover that we are still dealing with the themes of the Gospels. The devotional exercises in the group are planned to help local preachers not only to preach the Word, but to lead the worship of a congregation. We sing the great hymns and use readings drawn from the best devotional literature. We pray together.

There is not time to take a separate class for a course in English Literature, but illustrations taken from good poetry or a good biography or a good novel have often fostered an interest in good books.

A word must be said about the fellowship which comes from thinking together. To find parallels we should have to go back to the Methodist Class Meeting at its best, or to the days of the early Church. Many of us feel compelled to use the distinctive New Testament word *koinonia* because it so aptly describes the corporate life created by the Holy Spirit.

Finally, what can be said about results? This is pioneer work, attempted in war years when many of the most promising potential members have been away in the Services. In six years about 540 people have taken a year's course. It is the few rather than the many who will commit themselves to the discipline of continuity in study. But those who have responded have done so wholeheartedly. The registers are a record of regularity in attendance and loyalty to the fellowship. The harvest from such sowing needs time to mature, but there are signs that it is the kind of harvest one would most desire. Several groups are now led by those who joined first as members. A good many students have taken up further courses of study through the Methodist Study Centre (*Minutes*, 1945, p. 22). Of these one has successfully passed the examination for the London Diploma in Theology, and another, having completed her training at Kingsmead, will take up work as a travelling tutor in September. A few are candidates for the ministry. There have been many new recruits for the work of a local preacher. Day school teachers have been very keen to avail themselves of the opportunity offered by the groups.

It is of vital importance that the Methodist Church should mobilize its lay forces, equip and train them as preachers and teachers. Only if they share in a ministry that is truly apostolic will they make an impact on the paganism of today. 'Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst.' Emil Brunner's illuminating interpretation comes to my mind. 'Where two or three are gathered together in His name, there is the Church.' Christ is present to create, to renew, and to commission. He calls those who respond into the fellowship of the Church so that He may send them out again into the world as apostles with a divine mission. There are now in Methodism some hundreds, mainly of young people, who can claim to have been so called, and so commissioned through these groups.

BESSIE HIGGINS ('SISTER BESSIE')

Editorial Comments

GERMAN LEADER, OXFORD PHILOSOPHER,
METHODIST PREACHER

MENTION is made in these pages of three strong men — a reformer, a philosopher, and a happy warrior.¹

Martin Luther belongs to the ages. His fame has survived the fiercest storms of criticism and, after four hundred years, his work endures. One can almost hear him assuring his most recent traducers that no threat can make him deviate from the course he, by the grace of God, has set himself. 'If I had heard that as many devils would set on me in Worms as there are tiles on the roofs, still I would have gone there.' He could no other, and he would no other! Out of that certainty sprang much of what has been best in the German people and in European life as a whole. It would be easier to blame the Renaissance than the Reformation for some of the ills from which the world is suffering today, though it is stupid to imagine that in either lay the germs of inevitable disease. Luther was an apostle of a reformation more sweeping than the technical definition of a precise historic movement. He was 'concerned' for all mankind!

¹ See Articles by F. Gordon Rupp, W. F. Lofthouse, and F. Brompton Harvey.

The philosopher Alfred Edward Taylor, living in a more limited and sheltered community yet became the naked exemplar of his own deepest principles. He did not content himself with establishing right relations with his fellows and his Maker; he strove hard to 'live in them'. He has so recently passed from us that it is impossible to judge how far his thought and teaching will influence the life of tomorrow. It is enough for us to give thanks today that he unveiled for us Truth as he saw it.

The happy warrior, for so one thinks of Archibald Harrison, would have been amused to find himself, by chance, linked with the German monk and the Oxford philosopher — yet here is a natural association. How valiantly he would have fought at Luther's side! How remorselessly he and the Edinburgh professor insisted on truth! To some that seemed to be a dominating quality in his make-up. He loathed compromise, and yet was never intolerant. The truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth — that alone would satisfy him.

Who never sold the truth to serve the hour,
Nor paltered with Eternal God for power.

Some men might have become oblivious of their fellows and indifferent to the sufferings of a forlorn and stricken world. That would have been to miss some part of truth for him. So he went his way, crusading, taking hard blows and giving them, yet keeping firm in the saddle. In the stiffest encounter he retained that poise, which bore witness to deep peace within his inmost self. It has not been easy to accept his passing. His Church and his brethren could ill spare him. God must have had great need of him. Men will remember his steadfastness. 'Steel-true and blade-straight' he was a bonnie fighter for the Truth.

After the battle of Naseby, Oliver Cromwell spoke to his men of their comrades, fallen on the field. His words recur as one thinks of these three who, at different times, and in differing ways, shared in the same fight — the fight that goes on still. 'It may be thought that some praises are due to those gallant men of whose valour so much mention is made . . . It is their joy that they are instruments of God's glory and their country's good . . . All here have the same spirit of faith and prayer . . . Pity it is it should be otherwise anywhere.'

PROPAGANDA, PUBLICITY, AND THE PEOPLE

A word whose meaning has rapidly deteriorated in recent years is the word *propaganda*. The committee of cardinals in charge of foreign missions is officially named *congregatio de propaganda fide* but it is generally termed 'the Propaganda'. Originally the word implied the propagation of *truth*, but in these days it has become customary to speak of the spreading of *untruth*, or at best distorted truth, as *propaganda*. The word itself is now uttered contemptuously by the ordinary man. He discounts the value of information he distrusts, dismissing it with a shrug, as 'propaganda'.

At the same time another word has achieved a sudden popularity. In political, commercial and ecclesiastical councils reference is constantly made to *publicity*. The word evidently stands today, for something to be desired. It has lost, in some sense, its implication of vulgarity.

These changes are due to the increased importance of the masses, the emergence of 'the people' as the deciding factor in so many issues, and to the

new possibilities of communicating directly with them. The popular Press and radio have created a new situation.

The astonishing, if temporary, success of Hitler was due to his recognition of the strategic value of directing the mind of the mob. For ten years he made the vast majority of civilized men and women think about the subjects he defined. He became, as a well-known publicist remarked, in the columns of *The Observer*, 'the central figure everywhere'. His 'questions' and 'problems' became questions and problems to the man in the street. For a time the whole world hung on his words. British, French, and American statesmen had a relatively small audience. There came a moment when he arrogantly assured the masses that there should be no more surprises! His strength lay in his 'boiling down of politics to suggestive, simple, specific ideas, which he drove home by every method of the advertiser's trade . . . He fed the unthinking masses with predigested mental food'. The fact that truth was deliberately distorted does not, for the moment, concern us. The basic principles on which he worked are important, since they are as valid for the dissemination of truth and righteousness as they were for the propagation of falsehood and iniquity. The analysis of his method reveals his four essentials as initiative, simplicity, concreteness, and constant repetition. The writer to whom we have referred, maintains that 'to catch the masses a political creed must be able to say in two sentences what it intends to do with the world'. The history of the last thirty years shows how true this has been in the case of the Russian Revolution, and in the rise and development of National Socialism in Germany. The democratic nations have been slow to learn. The opening sessions of the United Nations Organization have shown that the principle has not yet been thoroughly grouped. Long, involved academic discussions may be necessary, but they will not win the masses until they are resolved into simple formulae which can be repeated as the basis for subsequent consideration. It is probably true that people are becoming gradually better informed but the process of political education is slow. In an election, votes cast should be as E. R. Pike has said in his recent book *Political Parties and Policies*, 'the result of conviction based on understanding, and not the expression of unreasoning hope, ignorant fear, or something not far removed from the merest indifference'.

The supreme purpose of U.N.O. is not to establish a particular ideology or even to reconcile divergent political theories, but to establish peace and righteousness over all the earth. It is a profound moral and religious issue. Unless this is clearly recognized it will cease to interest the people at large. Now is surely the time for those who see man's future material well-being as something dependent on his spiritual health to say so with simplicity and conviction. Let it be repeated constantly. We are struggling for the establishment of peace — a much bigger thing than the mere absence of war. It is disappointing that there should have been so little reference to spiritual values in the first meeting of U.N.O. The peoples of the world are looking wistfully and fearfully to the future. They will not accept the principle of self-sacrifice which true co-operation demands, unless they realize the splendour of the goal. An organization of united nations is good, but its permanence depends upon deep spiritual relationships. The dry bones must be quickened by the winds of God. Brotherhood is impossible without parent-hood, and the commonwealth of man is only possible within the family of God.

PALESTINE PROBLEM

Thousands of Service men are back home with a vision. They have been to Palestine. It may be that they will give a garbled account of scenes and places, but they are, for the most part, enthusiastic. The crude pictures on the walls of the Sunday school have leaped into life at last. Bethlehem, Nazareth, and Jerusalem are real. So, too, are Jews and Arabs — tragically real at times.

Strangely enough when one asks for a verdict, your Service man reveals himself, usually, as pro-Arab. This does not always mean that he is anti-Jew. Certainly he would disclaim any trace of anti-Semitism in his simple philosophy. It is, nevertheless, something of a shock to the folk at home to discover that he is quite conscious of the Arab's failings, yet disposed to be kindly in his judgement. It is useless to remind him of the history of Israel or to speak of the Chosen Race. He may become sarcastic or vitriolic, and outrage the old folk who have studied the problem by the fireside, with an unreal background.

There appear to be two reasons for his verdict. First, and less important, is the fact that the Arab has a sense of humour which appeals to him. 'He may rob you, but he will grin if you find him out!' Second, the type of Jew who has caused him and his comrade in the Palestine Police so much trouble is very different from the tragic figures in European Jewry. He is a political agitator, generally quite devoid of all religious sense. In his community centres he often has no room and no use for a synagogue. In short he is a very poor advocate of the cause of Judaism. This does not mean, of course, that one can dismiss the Jewish case for Palestine, but it does mean that whilst the Jewish agitator remains uncurbed there is little hope of a peaceful solution.

The Jewish problem is not an academic issue to be considered leisurely by economic specialists. It is an urgent responsibility which must be accepted by all decent people. However real was the need for action at the end of the First World War, it is infinitely greater now. In 1939 there were approximately sixteen million Jews of whom at least four millions were done to death in the concentration camps of Europe. Whole communities were destroyed, and cultural and religious activities which have been in operation for centuries have come to a grim end as the result of enemy action. 'Of over six million European Jews outside Russia, barely 1,250,000 have survived the 'Aryan' butcheries and murders', says Rabbi Epstein.¹

Many of these are living in unfriendly surroundings with little hope of permanent resettlement. Leadership has passed to the Jewries of English-speaking countries and of Palestine. We are faced with a direct and urgent challenge. 'Either', says James Parkes, 'Palestine must be made capable of fulfilling the needs of a large number of Jews, or the world has not only got to find some other place which will house a Jewish community of a million or more . . . but it has also to find several hundred million pounds to replace the work done already in Palestine.' Some violently advocate the claim of Palestine, whilst others look expectantly for an opening in the United States of America. There are those who feel that the complete solution can only be found in both countries. Should Palestine become a Jewish Commonwealth? Can the irresponsible Jewish politicians and the extremist Arab partisans be reconciled? In his searching analysis of Antisemitism, James Parkes (John Hadham) puts the

¹ *Judaism*, Epworth Press.

position clearly. 'In southern Syria conditions exist which in two rights confront each other, both valid; two desires confront each other, both legitimate, both entitled to our consideration. But they are in conflict, and the world is called to decide between them on a practical basis. The right basis seems to me that of supporting the greater need; of inflicting the lesser hardship. There are those — amongst them some who have occupied responsible positions in Palestine for many years — who feel that there is another way out of the difficulty. They advocate the internationalizing of Jerusalem, the focal city of three great religions. They would make the coastal lands a Jewish settlement, and give the Arabs the remainder of the country, Jews, they contend, are not naturally a pastoral people, whilst the Arab could be trusted to raise stock which he might exchange for the goods produced by the Jewish community. It might be that some such solution would provide conditions for more amicable relations between Jew and Arab in the future.'¹

However the matter may be settled it is certain that it can no longer be delayed, and it seems probable that success will lie with a scheme which meets, in part, the claims of both Arab and Jew.

THE NAZIS ON THE OXFORD GROUP

NEW SECRET DOCUMENT DISCOVERED

THE determination of the Nazis to eliminate Christianity is shown in a sixty-page secret report on the Oxford Group made by the Head Office of the Reich Security Department in 1942, which has just been discovered.

The Nazis denounce Dr. Buchman and the Oxford Group for 'the unequivocal taking up of a frontal position against National Socialism' because 'they encourage their members to place themselves fully beneath the Christian Cross, and to oppose the cross of the swastika with the Cross of Christ, as the former seeks to destroy the Cross of Christ'.

The document reveals that the secret police regarded the Oxford Group as 'the pace-maker of Anglo-American diplomacy' and as a force working 'to bring about new political and ideological conditions in the Reich'. 'The Group as a whole', it says, 'constitutes an attack upon the nationalism of the State and demands the utmost watchfulness on the part of the State. It preaches revolution against the National State, and has quite evidently become its Christian opponent.'

This report formed the basis of the directives by the Gestapo and German military authorities to suppress the Oxford Group in all countries under Nazi control, and to confiscate its offices and act against its leaders in Britain after the proposed invasion. It is apparently compiled from a careful study of literature about the Group, from the reports of secret agents and from the opening of correspondence.

¹ *An Enemy of the People: Antisemitism*, James Parks, Penguin Books (World Affairs).

THE ATTACK UPON THE REICH

The report opens with an account of the growth of the movement, and stresses from the first the Nazi fear of the spread of Christian teachings: 'Seldom has any religious revival movement succeeded, as the Oxford Group has, in establishing itself in such a relatively short time in almost all the countries of the world. Their influence is greatest in the Anglo-Saxon countries, especially England and the English dominions. The Nordic countries too, were intended to play a special role in the programme of the Oxford men: from these countries the attack of the Group missionaries upon the Reich was to be launched slowly and carefully with a view to bringing about new political and ideological conditions in Germany . . . With unexampled perseverance and tenacity the Oxford missionaries attempt to place the economic, social, cultural, and political structure of the nations and of humanity on a Christian basis.'

NAZISM AND CHRISTIANITY

There follows a detailed analysis of the teachings, methods, and 'ideological basis' of the Group, running to over thirty pages. This section openly reveals the hostility of the compilers of the report to Christian teaching in general. 'Frankly,' states the report in a section on 'Sin', 'the importance of the Group lies here. At the very time when we are making efforts to suppress Christian conviction of sin, which is regarded as the first step toward the enthralment of the German, a movement is emanating from the Anglo-Saxons, who are racially related to us, which regards just this consciousness of sin as a *basis* for change in personal and national relationships.'

In a similar manner, restitution for wrong-doing 'reveals at best a Jewish greed', the guidance of God 'means the end of all State discipline and order', and the Christian teaching on the stewardship of possessions laid down in St. Mark's Gospel, x. 29, 'which the Group seeks to put into practice . . . is Jewish usury morality pure and simple'.

THE GROUP AND NAZI RACE THEORIES

The report also attacks the Group for its belief in the democratic principle of the value of the individual, and for its desire to break down racial barriers: 'the Group movement teaches the equality of all men . . . No other Church movement has so strongly emphasized the supernatural and raceless character of Christianity as the Oxford Group. Particularly in our time, when national and racial consciousness is breaking through, this has special significance. It fanatically advocates making all men brothers.'

There follows a brief section on the relationship between the Group and the Churches, in which it is stated: 'Many leading churchmen in England, Canada, the East Indies, South Africa and, above all, in the churches of Norway, Denmark, and Switzerland, are active patrons and co-workers with the Oxford Group . . . The task of the Group is to constitute the front line of the international world church.'

The latter part of the report goes on to deal with the influence of the Group on Germany and in the Western Democracies.

'THE OXFORD GROUP IN GERMANY'

In a section entitled 'The Oxford Group in Germany' it is stated: 'The progress of the Group in Germany since 1933 has been marked by outstanding cautiousness. Great demonstrations such as were held in all other countries have been up to the present avoided on tactical grounds. The work has proceeded in deliberate obscurity and care has been taken to avoid public discussion as far as possible. If possible even the use of the post is avoided for messages and invitations; or, at any rate, ciphered letters are sent.'

The report then goes on to complain of 'the numerous pronouncements of leading Groupers revealing the anti-State, anti-National Socialist character of the Group', and quotes a declaration by one of them at a confidential meeting at Heidelberg in 1937: 'We will not engage in ostrich politics. We are clear what the position is. The State wants the total man, we too want the total man. We know that we are adversaries.' It also affirms that 'they had a habit of speaking in a very malicious and slanderous manner of National Socialist organizations. And the Jewish measures of the Reich drew from Group assemblies strong and repeated criticism'.

DR. BUCHMAN'S CALL FOR MORAL RE-ARMAMENT

The report then proceeds to assess the influence of the Oxford Group and its campaign for Moral Re-Armament in the democratic nations, and declares that 'under the slogan "Moral Re-Armament" it has become the pace-maker of Anglo-American diplomacy. The anti-German character of the brotherhood of Western democracies comes out clearly in the whole propaganda for this slogan, which has the delighted support of all Jewish protagonists of world democracy.'

'If one considers the names of the chief propagandists for Buchman's call to Moral Re-Armament in England, America, and elsewhere', continues the report, 'the political counterpart of the Oxford movement becomes plain: the Jewish Western democracies. Nor is there any room for doubting against whom this whole campaign was directed, if one bears in mind the year in which it took place: 1938, the year when — as it was said — Germany attacked little Austria with brutal force and brought the Sudetan Germans back into the Reich. It was also the year when England and her accomplices, not yet feeling themselves strong enough for a trial of arms with Germany, commenced this propaganda campaign against the armed Reich with the assistance of the Oxford movement.'

'The Oxford Group breathes the spirit of Western democracy,' it continues. 'It supplies the Christian-religious garment for the world democratic aims. The Group and the democracies supplement each other and render each other's work fruitful. What democracy opposes and fights because of its political ideology, the Oxford Group opposes because of its primitive Christian arguments. Their common opposition to the modern conception of race and nation has brought them still closer together.'

LESLIE F. CHURCH

Ministers in Council

NORTH-WESTERN MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION. The secretary of this Association, the Rev. H. Wakefield, reports that sessions are arranged for Tuesday to Thursday, 28th-30th May, at the Marshside Church, Southport. On the Tuesday evening the Association sermon will be preached by the Rev. G. Harrison. The theme for Wednesday morning will be 'What is the Gospel?' when the Rev. W. Madgen, M.A. will give an examination of two books, Raven's *The Good News of God* and Pastor Hildebrandt's *This is the Message*. The Rev. J. Spencer will present the critique. On Wednesday afternoon the Rev. S. H. Spode will deliver an essay on 'What is the Church?' and the critic will be the Rev. G. Fairfoot. At the public meeting on Wednesday evening the Rev. W. E. Burkett will speak on 'The Church in this Age' and the Rev. H. J. Charter-Rogers on 'The Gospel in this Age'. On Thursday morning the topic is to be 'Methodism and the Romantic Revival', on which the Rev. C. F. Gill, M.A. will read a paper, and discussion will be opened by the Rev. Ambrose Allcock.

A bibliography appended to the notice suggests the reading of Barclay's *Apology* and Father Alfred Fawkes' *The Church a Necessary Evil*, together with *The Church and the Twentieth Century*, edited by G. L. A. Harvey, and the Archbishops' Commission's Report on *Doctrine in the Church of England*.

* * * * *

A NEW CONCERN FOR THE CHURCHES. In *Teaching as a Career*, published by His Majesty's Stationery Office (3d.) are outlined facts which may well arrest our attention by the implication of calls upon the Churches in the fresh situation now being created. It is there stated that the Education Act 1944 is the most important educational measure since that of 1870. It provides for a large increase in the number of Nursery Schools for children between two and five years of age. It raises the school-leaving age from fourteen to fifteen and later to sixteen. It requires that boys and girls after ceasing full-time schooling shall continue their education up to eighteen years of age by attendance for one full day a week or the equivalent in County Colleges. As a consequence of these and other needs there will be a vast increase in the number of teachers wanted.

Before the war there were some 210,000 full-time teachers in schools and colleges. Of these about 200,000 were in elementary or secondary schools. Now to meet the demands of the new Act and to replace losses in teaching staff during or through the war there will be required some 70,000 additional teachers over and above normal recruitment.

Here then is a real source of concern and challenge to all the Churches. For, on the quality and efficiency of the new teachers will to a large extent depend the calibre of the rising generation.

* * * * *

A METHODIST DAY SCHOOL TEACHERS' HOUSE PARTY. With that concern in mind the Lincoln and Grimsby District has recently held a House Party at Sutton-on-Sea, attended by a number of primary- and secondary-school teachers from towns and villages in the county. Councillor T. W. West, J.P., a member of the Lindsey Education Committee, spoke on 'The Outworking of the new Education Act', referring to development plans and the relations between the Local Education Authority and the teachers and of both to the community. Miss P. Tagg, M.A., of the Gainsborough Girls' High School led very fruitful discussions on 'The Vocation of a Teacher' and 'Our New Opportunities'. Miss Elaine Hammerton, B.Sc., of the Methodist Study Centre, gave illuminating and much appreciated lectures on 'The Background of

Religious Education' and 'Methods of Bible Study'. Mr. N. G. Collins, J.P., headmaster of a most progressive and prosperous rural Modern School, gave an address on County Colleges and Village Work. Miss Doris W. Street of The Methodist Youth Department and lecturer at Westhill College also gave helpful advice.

Throughout the week-end ample facilities were afforded for frank conversations on the problems and programme of the teaching profession. This revealed a strong conviction on the part of all present that there is great urgency for closer co-operation between the Churches and day-school teachers. The call of the State for so many new teachers constitutes a demand also on the Christian community to foster in teachers, present and future, the sense of dedication to a God-given task and to assist in training, especially in fuller equipment for religious instruction.

* * * * *

THE CHURCH AND SPECIALISTS IN RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION. To secure adequate and efficient religious instruction in the day schools of the land some have advocated the entry of the clergy and ministers into the schools for this purpose. A better way, and one in all respect more tending to the unity of the school life, is to have the members of the regular staff engaged in this work, so long as they are able and willing. But how ensure ability? An answer to that question was given in detail at the Sutton-on-Sea House Party to an eagerly interested audience of teachers.

To encourage day-school teachers to become recognized experts in religious instruction the Methodist Study Centre (51 Warrington Road, Harrow, Middlesex) is ready at a nominal fee to give tuition by correspondence leading up to examination standard required for Certificate or Diploma of the London University.

The London University offers its Certificate of Proficiency in Religious Knowledge upon an examination held once a year. A candidate must take four compulsory subjects and two optional. The compulsory subjects include two papers of General Knowledge, one on the Old Testament and the other on the New Testament. The syllabus of those two subjects is thus described: i. A general knowledge of the contents of the Old Testament including outlines of the history of Israel and of its religion, and the leading ideas characteristic of the principal books of the Old Testament. ii. A general knowledge of the contents of the New Testament, especially the life and teaching of Jesus, the life and teaching of St. Paul, the story of the primitive church in Acts; the arguments and leading ideas of the Epistles. The other two compulsory papers are Old Testament selected subject, e.g. for 1946-8 Isaiah xl-lxvi, and New Testament selected subject, e.g. for 1946-8 St. Mark.

For these four compulsory subjects, in addition to the Biblical text, are recommended certain books. The mention of these will indicate the nature of the knowledge expected. For the study of the Old Testament are suggested *A Short History of the Hebrews* by B. K. Rattey (Oxford University Press, 2s. 9d.), H. Wheeler Robinson's *The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament* (Duckworth, 4s.), G. W. Wade's *Old Testament History* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.) and the first four volumes of *The Clarendon Bible* (Oxford University Press, 5s. each), together with J. Skinner's *Isaiah* (Cambridge Bible, 5s. 6d.). For the study of the New Testament are recommended *The Four Gospels: their literary history*, by M. Jones (S.P.C.K., 4s. 6d.), *The Acts of the Apostles: a commentary*, by J. A. Findlay (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.), *A Guide to the Epistles of St. Paul* by H. N. Bate (Longmans, 4s. 6d.), together with *St. Mark in the Clarendon Bible* (Oxford University Press, 5s.).

From seven Optional Subjects a candidate must take two. These include Introduction to the Old Testament, Introduction to the Four Gospels and the Pauline Epistles; Greek Testament; A Period of Church History; The Comparative Study of Religions; History of Christian Doctrine; Christian Worship. Here again the scope may be gathered from the books recommended on Biblical Introduction. For Old

Testament Introduction is suggested *The Old Testament, its making and meaning* by H. Wheeler Robinson (University of London Press, 7s. 6d.). On the second subject there are recommended *An Introduction to the New Testament* by F. B. Clogg (University of London Press, 7s. 6d.), *The Gospels, a short introduction* by Vincent Taylor (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.), *A Guide to the Epistles of St. Paul* by H. N. Bate (Longmans, 4s. 6d.).

The examination may be taken as a whole at a fee of one pound or in two parts at a fee of twelve shillings and sixpence for each part. It would be of great service to the cause of religious education if the above information could be widely made known and teachers encouraged to qualify for the Certificate.

The London University also offers a Diploma in Theology available for those who have matriculated and who take New Testament Greek. The subjects are Old Testament, New Testament, Biblical Theology, Philosophical Introduction to Theology, Church History, and one of six other subjects. (These six include Hebrew, Introduction to the Vulgate, Comparative Study of Religions, English Church History, Christian Ethics, The History and Development of Christian Worship.) For this Diploma also the Methodist Study Centre provides tuition.

It is gratifying to learn that the Methodist Study Centre has already enrolled a number of teachers for courses leading up to both the Certificate and the Diploma.

* * * * *

'EDUCATION IN ENGLAND'. Mr. W. Kenneth Richmond, M.A., M.E.D., evidently hugely enjoyed himself in writing the book bearing this title (Pelican books). And so too most probably will the reader, for it is full of sparkle and verve. The writer gives good measure and mixes historical review with modern criticism. His nine chapters with bibliography and index are amazing value for money.

He believes that democratic education is only possible through the religious spirit. He asserts that the Churches are right in thinking that education needs to be saved from itself and that every ramification of knowledge, arts or sciences, can lead nowhere unless to divinity. As he puts it, it is just as wrong to regard a man as superior because of the size of his brain as it is to pay him deference because of the size of his bank-balance or the length of his pedigree. Without religion it would be impossible to reconcile the belief that all men are equal with the only too obvious fact that all men are different. As against Huxley, he holds that it is only by positing the existence of something going on beyond space and time that the conception of the Common Man can take on any reality. But having said that, he wholeheartedly condemns the dual system which he brands as infamous. He stoutly avers that if the churches were amongst the first agents in education that fact does not carry with it the right to perpetual intervention. He bluntly states that if the clergy fulfil their tasks to the best of their ability, surely teachers ought to be trusted to fulfil theirs. Denominationalism has its proper place, but that place is not in the school.

* * * * *

A LAYMAN AS EVANGELIST. At a time when evangelism is again fast coming to its own in the Churches, many will find much interest in the views and incidents related by a well-known lay missionary, Mr. T. B. Rees, in *His Touch has still its Ancient Power* (Pickering & Inglis, 3s. 6d.). Here is a sample instance. In one of his mission services a police constable was converted. A day or so later P. C. Watson was making his little boy a toy out of an old box. While hammering, he hit the wrong nail. Before his conversion that would have led to an oath. This time Watson bit his lip and went on hitting the right nail. His little boy waited apprehensively and after a pause looked up at his father and said 'But, daddy, aren't you going to say anything?'

Later the same man was told by a district inspector to tell a class of recruits how

to ta
is wh
he's
that
is rig
he re
An
prod
creat
attit
Chri
work
a per
sign
who
conf
is the
Li
and
state

The
Th
Test
(nota
ment
Gosp
the t
(2) th
are a
coun
is for
accur
a mo
he ad
or tes
know
well
Profe
reput
since
ways
woul
that
'Thos
pray
heavy

to take a statement from a dying man who was found injured by the roadside. This is what he said: 'Men, if you find a man at the roadside dying, ask him first of all if he's made his peace with God. If he hasn't, tell him that Christ died for him, and that he can have peace in His shed blood. Then when you are really satisfied that he is right with his Maker — and if he is still conscious — question him concerning what he remembers of the accident.'

And here are some of his dicta: 'The Holy Spirit does not always convict men by producing an overwhelming sense of guilt. Sometimes, as he did in my own case, he creates dissatisfaction, an inescapable sense of need. . . . "Plan first, pray afterwards" attitude is the result of a fundamentally wrong conception of the true nature of Christian service. Let us not look on ourselves as workers *for* God but rather as workers *with* God. . . . Publicity alone is practically useless unless it is followed up by a personal invitation. . . . Decision forms can be wisely used as an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace. The New Testament teaches clearly that those who turn to Christ should immediately confess Him publicly. But surely such confession of Christ should only *follow*, never precede, conversion, for what advantage is the outward and visible sign if there be no inward and spiritual grace?'

Lieut.-General Sir William Dobbie contributes a Foreword commending the book and stressing his conviction that it is the condition of Christians rather than the state of the world which hinders revival.

W. E. FARNDAL

Recent Literature

The Intention of Jesus (I). By J. W. Bowman. (S.C.M. 8s. 6d.)

This well-documented book comes to us from an American professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis. Though it owes much to British scholars (notably Professor T. W. Manson), the writer throughout shows independent judgement. Perhaps the most substantial contribution he has made to the study of the Gospels is to be found in chapter 47. There the author gives us five tables in which the titles applied to Jesus by (1) the authors of the sources cited in our Gospels, (2) the crowd, (3) the enemies of Jesus, (4) the disciples, and (5) our Lord Himself, are arranged. The writer rightly insists that sources must be 'evaluated', not merely counted; to Sir Edwyn Hoskyns' canon that 'where the testimony of several sources is found to converge on a single affirmation, we may be reasonably sure of the accuracy of the result obtained' and 'it must be concluded that the critic is obtaining a more or less clear insight into the actual teaching and actions of Jesus of Nazareth', he adds another which is equally valuable: 'generally speaking the further the opinion or testimony of a witness adduced by one of our sources is found to diverge from the known position of the author of the source concerned, the more credence, we may well believe, is to be placed in the authenticity of such testimony.' In this connexion Professor Bowman observes that 'studies of this type will eventually rehabilitate the reputation of M^t — the source of most of the material peculiar to the First Gospel — since 'other materials available afford evidence that Jesus taught and acted in the ways testified to by' this document. This is cautiously worded, and the reviewer would express himself more strongly, but it is welcome, as far as it goes. It is amazing that the source to which we owe such sayings as 'Blessed are the pure in heart', 'Thou when thou prayest, enter into thy secret chamber, and having shut the door, pray to thy Father in the secret place', 'Come unto Me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will refresh you', as well as most of our Lord's teaching about 'the

little ones', and the 'parables' — if parables they really are — of 'the ten virgins' and 'the sheep and the goats', should seldom be mentioned by progressive scholars without a suggestion of depreciation. The titles applied to Jesus are 'Prophet', 'Healer', 'Teacher', 'Son of God', 'Son of Man', 'Messiah'. The author does not include 'Lord' or 'Son of David'. He thinks that 'Lord' is 'probably a Greek attempt to translate the Hebrew concept of "Messiah" into the pagan thought-mould'. Is this really the explanation of the appearance of the title '*kyrie*' in the Greek Gospels? What about 'Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say'? Or, alternatively, should the 'Lord' of the Gospels always be translated 'Sir', as in Mark vii. 28, John xii. 21? 'Son of David' is obviously equivalent to 'Messiah', and so is rightly excluded. Professor Bowman points out (p. 121) that 'Son of God' is used by a (presumably) Gentile centurion in Mark xv. 39; if he was a Gentile, it probably represents 'Son of the gods', if he was a Jew, 'a perfectly righteous man' (cf. Luke xxiii. 47).

The conclusions which our author reaches as a result of his study of the titles applied to Jesus may be summarized roughly as follows: (1) As to the authors, Mark evidently holds a 'Son of God' Christology, but does not intrude it into his narrative; in 'Q' Jesus is regarded as 'Healer' and 'Teacher', and in 'L' as 'Prophet', 'Healer', and 'Teacher' (the proportions between the three being about the same as in Mark); in 'M' 'Healer' preponderates over both 'Prophet' and 'Teacher'; in John 'Teacher' preponderates over 'Healer'; 'Son of God' is confined to 'M' and John (the author does not accept 'Son of God' as part of the text of Mark i. 1), the 'Christ' to 'M' and John. Against 'the Son of Man' the author puts a blank under his first heading, but ought he not to count passages, like Matthew xvi. 13 and Luke vi. 22, in which the fact that one source has 'Son of Man' where another has 'I' implies that the author of the source habitually thought of Jesus as 'the Son of Man'? (2) As for the crowd, only Mark and John have much to say about their names for Jesus; all but 'Q' mention that the crowds thought of Him as 'Prophet', all but 'M' that they thought of Him as 'Healer', all but 'Q' again that they addressed Him as 'Teacher'. In Mark alone (xv. 39) do members of the crowd call Him 'Son of God', whereas they give Him the title 'Messiah' five times in 'M' and three times in John, the one instance in Luke being editorial. (3) For the enemies of Jesus, He is thought of as 'Healer' in all but 'M', as 'Teacher' in all. (4) The disciples call Jesus 'Prophet' only once (in 'L'); in 'Q' and (surprisingly) in 'M' they call Him 'Teacher' but only once, in 'L' twice, six times in Luke, seven in Mark and eight in John. They call Him 'Son of God' twice in 'M', and three times in John — 'Messiah' once in Mark and three times in John. (5) Jesus speaks of Himself as 'Prophet' twice in Mark, three times in 'Q', never in 'M', once in 'L' and John. He never calls Himself 'Healer' in 'Q', but does so three times in Mark and once in 'M', 'L', and John; He speaks of Himself as 'Teacher' twice in Mark, once in 'Q', 'M', and 'L' (? added editorially by Luke), and three times in John. He called Himself 'Son of God' (or, more strictly, 'the Son') three times in Mark, twice in 'Q', once in 'M', never in 'L', eight times in John — the 'Messiah' once in Mark, never in 'Q', twice in 'M', once in 'L' (if Luke ii. 49 is 'L'), and once in John — 'Son of Man' eleven times in Mark, seven in 'Q', three in 'M', twice in 'L' (perhaps added once more by the evangelist) and seven times in John. Our conclusions from the evidence may not always coincide with our author's, but we are grateful for the clear way in which he has arrayed it. The present writer would demur to many of his judgements in detail — noticeably as to the 'worldliness' of all the Sadducees (on this matter Professor G. F. Moore has warned us against so sweeping a condemnation of this party). And does 'Take my yoke' mean 'Obey me'? Does it not mean 'the yoke which I am willing to share with you' (obedience to the Father)? But these are

only differences on particular points; about the value of the author's contribution to Gospel-criticism there can be no question.

J. A. FINDLAY

The First Epistle of St. Peter. By E. G. Selwyn. (Macmillan. 25s.)

Lightfoot's *Galatians*, published about eighty years ago, was the first of a series of commentaries on books of the New Testament published by Macmillan, many of which have been, and still are, of great value. A new volume in this series arouses high expectations. This commentary, by the Dean of Winchester, may well stand beside its predecessors in the series. Dr. Hort's commentary on this Epistle was a fragment only. Dr. Bigg's commentary on *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* was written before this century began. More recently there have appeared commentaries on 1 *Peter* by the present Bishop of London, in the Westminster Commentary series, and by Moffatt in the *Commentary* which he edited, and by Windisch. But the encyclical letter which Dr. Selwyn has previously described in a course of lectures as the *Epistle of Courage* has not before been treated so fully as in this latest commentary.

Dr. Selwyn believes that this Epistle is authentic; that Silvanus was the amanuensis; and that the affinities between it and *Romans* and *Ephesians* are due not to dependence, but to the things that were common to their authors — the historical facts of the Gospel, the practical problems with which they were dealing, and the Pauline influence on Silvanus. To the amanuensis he attributes the good style of the Greek, though he thinks a strain of poetry in Peter had some part in this. He holds that the Epistle was written when 'the flood tide of Christian expansion... [had been] momentarily arrested by the menace or experience of persecution'. The Churches addressed contained both Jews and Gentiles. The persecutions mentioned are rather social than official. The date may be in A.D. 63 or early 64 — i.e. after the death of James in 62 and before the persecution under Nero in 64. There is a long, but by no means too long, section on the theology and ethics of the Epistle. The commentary on the text, which fills about 130 pages, is clear in exposition and discriminating in judgement. Many readers will turn with special interest to the exposition of the much debated verses iii. 19 and iv. 6. They will be rewarded by a careful and frank exposition, elaborated in an additional essay as an appendix. In the 'spirits in prison' (iii. 19) Dr. Selwyn thinks the reference is to supernatural powers of evil, which were made subject to Christ, in His death and resurrection. He translates iv. 6, 'Christ was preached to the dead' — i.e. to the Christians who have died. He does not think these passages support the 'Larger Hope'. There are several additional notes on critical and theological points. Besides the essay already mentioned, there is another on the interrelation of 1 *Peter* and other New Testament Epistles (treated more fully than in the Introduction), and a long note by Dr. David Daube on Participle and Imperative in 1 *Peter*, controverting Moulton's views. A curious lapse in the abbreviations of books quoted is that in Moulton's *Grammar of N.T. Greek*, only Vol. I and Vol. II, Part 1 are named. Vol. II was completed by Dr. W. F. Howard and published in 1929 and has long taken its rightful place as the standard work of reference. The style of this commentary is in accordance with the previous volumes in a long and notable series. We are grateful to Dr. Selwyn for a book which demands and will abundantly repay careful study.

F. B. CLOGG

Religious Experience. A Lecture Delivered at Oriel College. By C. C. J. Webb. (Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d.)

This lecture, given at Oriel College, has been republished in connexion with the

celebration of Professor Webb's eightieth birthday, in June 1945. A foreword by Professor Grensted and a bibliography of Professor Webb's writings are included. C. C. J. Webb has had a remarkable influence during the long years of his work at Oxford, which were crowned by his being the first professor of the philosophy of the Christian religion there, a chair founded with Webb's attainments and scholarship specially in view. It is one of the two theological chairs open to laymen. The list of his scholars included in this volume speaks much for the debt the philosophy of religion owes to him.

In the main the lecture is a characteristic exposition of the philosophy Webb consistently expounded. Religion is a human experience, but none the less a divine revelation, since it is impossible that God should be revealed save through His own action. Hence the object of religious experience is that of God's self-revelation. Webb, however, refuses to separate the knowledge given by revelation from other knowledge of God, as if it were a thing apart. Nor will he allow that any part of the knowledge we possess is sacrosanct and unquestionable. 'I can recognize infallibility nowhere, in Pope, of Church, or Bible.' In the religious experience of man as a whole, there is, Professor Webb declares, a genuine unity of response of the human to the Divine Spirit, though this need not imply that of Christianity is to be classified as one of the world's religions and no more. Professor Webb refers to the 'senile love of reminiscence' but there is nothing senile in this vigorous lecture, given in the lecturer's eightieth year. Mature, yes, but very much alive — that is the right estimate, and if it should be the lecturer's swan-song, nothing could be more characteristic of a mind that for many years has given only one quality to the writings which have expressed it — the best.

E. S. WATERHOUSE

The Rediscovery of Belief. By Louis Arnaud Reid. (The Lindsey Press. 6s.)

A voyage of discovery, an examination of the defects of much of our current thinking and believing, and a fresh and critical scrutiny of the nature and claims of the Christian religion, is a fairly wide programme. This book is a very worthy attempt to fulfil it, however, and it is the more welcome on account of the independent point of view from which it is written. The author remarks that there has been much redrafting and rethinking in the process of making the book, and that the order of the chapters does not exactly follow the direction in which his thought moved. There are indications of this, and the argument does not flow quite so easily and naturally as might otherwise have been the case. The general theme is the decay of belief, the need for a fresh vision of man as a whole, and the rediscovery of a doctrine of man and man's chief end. Economic materialism, freedom, education, and humanism, the 'broad and strong streak' of hedonism in the contemporary outlook, and the relation of religion to morality are all discussed. In the second half of the book the author becomes philosophically and theologically constructive, albeit from a modern and liberal standpoint.

Dr. Reid points out that many of the facts and inferences arising out of modern Biblical criticism are almost totally unknown among ordinarily intelligent Christians. He asks how this comes about. Is it a lack of candour and honesty, and at whose door does it lie? On the other hand an honest, courageous, open, and explicit statement of what enlightened and scholarly leaders of the Protestant churches do actually nowadays believe about fundamentals, as well as what they do *not* believe, is called for. But Dr. Reid is under no delusion as to what the retort of his 'theological and clerical friends' will be. These worthy people are so familiar, even so bored with the results of modern scholarship, that although they have been using them secretly — or is it surreptitiously? — in their own studies, they have never expounded them frankly to

other folk. Our author may be a little too generous in attributing this familiarity to all his critics, but there is boredom along with familiarity nevertheless. It is unfortunate that leaders of thought should be wrongly *supposed* to believe what they do not and are not even expected to believe nowadays! Dr. Reid therefore takes his way among the fundamentals of philosophy and theology with a view to putting things in modern terms and in more discreet proportion. Some of the traditional beliefs which are still said, sung, or imposed as tests, are founded upon a view of the Bible which we now know to be erroneous, or upon questionable theology and philosophy, and the author of this book is prepared to restate some and abolish others 'as assertions of personal creedal belief'. He clearly has his eye upon the thoughtful youth of our day, and he is not very far wrong when he reminds us that they have nothing but contempt for what is deemed to be dishonesty, confusion, ignorance, lack of wit to see the problems of the new age, and 'guts' to tackle problems courageously. If this condition is long maintained Dr. Reid sees the Protestant churches 'virtually empty' in thirty or forty years. His book deserves the serious attention of thoughtful people for its independence, candour, and general helpfulness.

R. SCOTT FRAYN

God and the Atom. By Ronald Knox. (Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.)

Has the Atomic Bomb changed everything or nothing in the world? Is it simply another of the agents of destruction which science has placed in our hands, or is it going to transform human life on the earth and human thought about the universe and God? Does it merely supply a new problem to UNO, or does it force us to choose between extinction and a new age of lasting peace? Does it shake the whole fabric of our scientific confidence by revealing indeterminacy at the heart of nature? Is it, like fire, a good gift of God, though, like His other gifts, to be treated with respect and care, or does it undermine our faith by compelling us to ask how God — if He exists — could have devised and allowed it? Such are the questions on the lips of most of us in these anxious days, and with these Mgr. Knox sets himself to deal. He is no longer the jaunty controversialist of *Some Loose Stones*, which he flung at the heads of the earnest young Oxford thinkers who combined to write *Foundations*. He is very much in earnest himself, and his little book was written, it appears, when the sky was still dark with the lurid clouds above Hiroshima and before the Security Council had decided to take the bomb in hand. But he is resolved to keep his balance. As a good Catholic, he will even invite us to consider the relevance of the Thomist conception of causality to the bomb. Nor is this to fiddle while Rome is doomed; for Ronald Knox God is still on the throne. What the bomb teaches is that 'we need an acceleration in the tempo of our spiritual reactions'. Looked at aright, it will quicken our faith, our hope, and our love. It may be that we are being challenged, like Pharaoh of the stubborn heart, to learn to consider the bomb as the early Christians or Francis of Assisi might have done, and to remember that it is the will of God, and not our own happiness or content, that matters. Perhaps the world is doomed, and the heavens are to be rolled up as a garment; the Christian waits to meet his Lord in the skies. 'Brother Atom' might then become, in Thomas à Kempis's words, a 'manual of holy teaching', when seen from God's end, not man's. Yet how much better if the bomb had been dropped, not on Hiroshima, but on some neighbouring and bare hill-side! This is a suggestive yet tantalizing essay. But if God is to give us clear guidance in the future, every thoughtful Christian, whether Romanist or Protestant, will have to ponder such suggestions as Mgr. Knox makes in this book.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

Islam and Christian Theology; Part I, Volume One. By J. Windrow Sweetman. (Lutterworth Press. 16s.)

In this volume the Rev. J. Windrow Sweetman, of the Henry Martyn School of Islamic Studies, Aligarh, has given us the first instalment of what promises to be a worthy addition to the vigorous contributions to theological scholarship which in recent years have come from the Church overseas. When completed the work will consist of three parts, the first dealing with the early development of Islam, the second expounding Muslim scholasticism and its relations with Christian scholasticism, and the third setting forth the writer's constructive conclusions. In this, the first of the two volumes in Part I Mr. Sweetman presents the evidence for Christian influence on Islam in the early period.

It is well known that the *Qur'an* itself bears evidence to Christian and Jewish influence. The presence of Jewish communities among the Arabs and the expansion of Eastern Christianity, both orthodox and heretical, made this practically inevitable. The very words *Islām* and *Qur'an* can be traced to the Syrian-speaking Church. The Talmud and Apocrypha, as well as the canonical Jewish and Christian scriptures, made their contribution; and the ritual directions and doctrine of the *Qur'an* reflect the environment in which Islam was born. In a closely packed section Mr. Sweetman gives an admirable survey of the doctrinal parallels. He is careful, however, not to seek to prove too much. A common background and the use of cognate languages doubtless account for some of the facts, and direct documentary dependence is not always to be sought. For a full exposition of the writer's own judgement we must wait for the publication of his final volume. The development of Islam and its geographical expansion brought a more accurate knowledge of Christian faith and practice. The *Hadīth* show clear signs of deliberate borrowing from Christianity. The growing admiration for the ascetic ideal is of particular interest. Again, similarities to the characteristics of the great Christian schools may be traced in later Islamic thought. The Alexandrian outlook was reflected, not only in Sufism, but in the orthodox theologians and the exponents of the 'Arabian philosophy'. The Cappadocian emphasis on tradition is almost a Christian anticipation of *sunnā*. The bias of Antioch toward Aristotelianism and its links with Arianism and Nestorianism have obvious significance. A good deal that Islam took over was not specifically Christian but part of the Church's inheritance from Greece. The tragedy is that so much of what the Muslim had presented to him as Christian was in fact heretical. Monarchian Christology and Pelagian anthropology have significant parallels in the Muslim conception of prophethood and Islam's rejection of original sin.

The first section of the book ends with an admirable account of the work of John of Damascus and his fellow-apologists, and an appraisal of their main arguments. A misleading Christology and an inadequate soteriology weakened their testimony to the faith. But the most cogent reply on the Muslim side was the success of the armies of Islam. A Church which had seen in the fall of Jerusalem the divine rejection of Judaism could not easily rebut an argument based on this success. Section two of the volume is concerned with the introduction of philosophy into Islam. After a brief account of the early translations of Greek philosophical works into Arabic there follows a translation of the *Shorter Theology* (*Al Fawz ul Asghhar*) of Ibn Miskawaih concerning God, the Soul, and Prophethood. The translator's annotations refer us to the relevant parallels in Greek philosophy and in John of Damascus. It is to Aristotle that Ibn Miskawaih is chiefly indebted, but, like other Muslim writers, he draws on Platonism and Neoplatonism also, without much discrimination, 'confounding the substance' of his borrowings and at times failing to distinguish his authorities. It is impossible in a short review to give an adequate account of the mass of evidence which Mr. Sweetman has assembled; only some indication of its scope has been given.

Students of Islam and of Christian doctrine will await with eagerness the appearance of the remaining volumes of this erudite and illuminating work.

G. W. ANDERSON

Protestantism. Edited by William K. Anderson. (Methodist Press, Nashville, Tennessee. \$1.)

This symposium by twenty-seven American theologians covers a great range of Church History, and relates it to a wide field of present work. It discusses a subject which Methodist writers in this country have strangely neglected during this generation, except for the over-worked eighteenth century. The book deserves a more attractive title than the one word 'Protestantism'. Why not, 'The Evangelical Tradition'? And 'Behind us and before' would be a better sub-title than 'A Symposium'. Part I deals with history. In an excellent summary Professor J. T. McNeill justifies the Reformation by relating the abuses of the times. In marking the decline from primitive simplicity Dr. Rist perhaps makes things a little too simple. He takes one's breath away by such phrases as 'the pseudo-Pauline work called Ephesians'; still more when, speaking of the first- and second-century emphasis on that which is 'Apostolic', he concludes, 'We find ourselves in complete agreement with those Protestant churches which have abandoned it as a religious fiction that . . . has no validity for us'. The book goes on to describe the various strands of Protestantism — Lutheran, Zwinglian, Calvinist, Anglican, Independent — and all this, and more, as it works out in America's bewildering varieties. Here are two startling statements from Dr. C. S. Braden: 'There are in the United States about 30,000 full-time practicing astrologers'; 'The yearbook of the churches lists 258 denominations . . . [but there are] at least 100 which are not listed.' An excellent article by Professor Sweet gives just the sort of material that we in this country need to build up our knowledge of the American church situation. For instance, he points out that 'The left wing of the Reformation came to its completion and fulfilment in America'. Again, in these days when we bewail decline it is good to read 'In the United States the proportion of the churchd to the unchurchd is gradually growing. . . . Church membership in proportion to the total population increases'.

Part II, Interpretations, deals with Protestantism in relation to the Bible, Theology, Sacraments, Music, Preaching, Mysticism, Ethics, and the 'Open Mind'. Here the articles are of varying merit. On the whole this hundred pages is less useful than other parts of the book. It is difficult to write briefly of attitudes to this and that, when, as Part I has been reminding us, Protestantism is so diverse. Part III, Opportunities, might well be taken as linking up with another striking paragraph of Professor Sweet's, 'The very fact that American Protestantism is so much divided has been one of the reasons for the growing concern for ecumenicity. For the first time there is a compelling interest in "the Church"'. Formerly we were accustomed to think only in terms of "the churches". The articles on the Far East and Europe suffer from being written before the War ended. The difficult subject of Latin America rightly claims a place, but why, one may ask, is the continent of Africa left out? A racy section on American education pleads for a more positive Protestant contribution here. Nothing like our 'agreed syllabus' seems to be in sight. A few pages — too few — on 'Our Responsibility for a New World' bring us to a *finale* such as we should expect from the pen of Dr. Van Dusen, whom we know as having 'found the Church *there*'. He shows it to us *here*, especially in the building up of the World Council. Then, looking to the future, he adds his final word, 'Our greatest need is revival'.

JOHN FOSTER

A Preacher's Legacy. By Frederic C. Spurr. (Epworth Press. 5s.)

The Significance of Silence. By Leslie D. Weatherhead. (Epworth Press. 7s. 6d.)

The Grace and the Love. By Harold S. Darby. (Epworth Press. 5s.)

Methodism's Message in Modern Terms. By H. Mortimer Sinfield. (Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.)

God's Word for His World. By Bernard R. H. Spaull. (Independent Press. 4s. 6d.)

These five books have all to do with preaching or the message of the preacher, not only during the years of war but the equally perplexing times of peace. It is only at first that this may not seem to be a true description of *A Preacher's Legacy*, for Mr. Spurr passed away in 1942 when over eighty years of age. Throughout his long life as a Baptist minister in England and Australia, his sermons were always 'up to date' for they were all upon the timeless and eternal truths. Such sermons suit all times. The present volume consists of notes and material for sermons found after the preacher himself had passed to higher service. It is full of helpful suggestions and illustrations and will be of deep interest not only to preachers but also to many others who remember Mr. Spurr.

Mr. Weatherhead's latest book, *The Significance of Silence*, takes its title from the first of a number of sermons preached during the years of war in St. Sepulchre's Church after the destruction of the City Temple, now nearly four years ago. To these sermons he has added two addresses on the City Temple and its worship as it used to be and as it is to be in days to come. There is also an 'Ordination Charge' which is surely unique in the history of the Church, for it was delivered in an Anglican Church by a Methodist at the ordination of a Congregational minister. Such a service may be regarded as symbolic, not only of the essential unity of the Church Catholic, but also of the way in which all preachers share in a central message. True catholicity is the mark of this volume of sermons. There is a questionnaire for use in classes which will increase the value of the book. We recommend this volume to all who value the Christian Gospel, for the sermons are written in a form finely fitted 'to serve the present age'.

Another book sure of a welcome is *The Grace and the Love*, by Harold S. Darby. The words of the Benediction are, for many of us, in danger of losing, through over familiarity, their original wonder, power, and inspiration. Nothing is more needed by the Church today than a rediscovery of the timeless Love of God as it is made known to us by the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. In this book the author calls us back both to the public and the private 'means of grace'; under the first he emphasizes especially the Holy Communion, the preaching of the Word, and the fellowship which our fathers found in the Methodist class-meeting and under the second, private prayer, the intelligent reading of the Scriptures, and the use of the *Methodist Hymn-book* and other books of devotion. With the 'means of grace' he couples the 'hope of glory', the glory of that new heaven and earth for which the first were made. We are grateful for the plain and forceful language of this much-needed message.

In *Methodism's Message in Modern Terms*, Mr. Sinfield gives us the same teaching from another point of view. So far is he from believing that Methodism has exhausted its vocation that he is convinced that what is necessary and indeed essential for the needs of the Church and of the world today is a recovery of the emphasis which our fathers laid upon the doctrines of 'Salvation by Faith', 'Assurance', 'Holiness', 'The Universal Grace of God', and 'The Inevitable Judgement'. But these doctrines must be proclaimed in terms of twentieth-century thought and knowledge. It is still as true as ever that 'it is the heart which makes the theologian', and this book has a value far beyond its modest price.

The last of these five books is by a well-known Congregational Minister. In the title *God's Word for His World*, Mr. Spaull places the emphasis on the word 'His' and this emphasis is maintained until the climax is reached in the last page. In these

perplexing days, as always, there is but one ultimate authority over the Church, its Scriptures and indeed over all things human, and that is the authority of the Spirit of the Living Christ. If the Churches and their members would but place themselves at His disposal, we should 'release incalculable forces capable of shaping the whole future of humanity'. The book is an inspiration and we shall look forward to others from the same author.

THOS. H. BARRATT

Mother of Carmel. By E. Allison Peers. (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.)

Professor Peers has had to cope in this volume with the difficulties of his own erudition and vast knowledge of his subject. It is extraordinarily difficult to give strangers to his subject a portrait of St. Teresa of Jesus, particularly since he has chosen to make her known largely through a thousand apt quotations from her words. While he gives us an admirable impression of St. Teresa, his book is more like a broadcast than a portrait. We hear the saint's voice rather than see her figure. The result is in some ways a less satisfactory picture than a lesser authority might have provided. On the other hand, we are very grateful for this book and for all it tells us of perhaps the most attractive of all Christian mystics. All the traits of her colourful and many-sided character are here exemplified — her discretion and common sense, her practicality, her humour and her courage. In some ways she was typical of the middle ages, in others of the modern world, but she was always Spanish and always Catholic, a flowering of Catholic sanctity at the time of the Reformation in the country of religious 'Blimps'. Catholics have often derided the Protestant emphasis on the access of the individual to God, but in this Interior Castle in Spain there is perhaps more of this than in the *Feste Burg* of Luther. Yet, like Pascal, Teresa lived within the fabric of orthodoxy and, though she was often disturbed by the wooden incomprehension of the authorities, this never disturbed her own loyal obedience. In this book Professor Peers has given us food for soul as well as mind. We glimpse both the fatigue and annoyances of sixteenth-century travel and the more joyous and arduous journeys in the world of the spirit. It is typical of Teresa's life that her last prayer should take up this figure, 'My Lord, it is time to set out: may the journey be a propitious one and may thy will be done'. I am glad that Professor Peers has given us in full and in translation the delightful de-lousing hymn which St. Teresa wrote for 'sisters' who had not learned to face the minor horrors of medieval life with Franciscan equanimity.

E. G. RUPP

Through the Mill: The Life of Joseph Rank. By R. G. Burnett. (Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.)

This book would at any time be of extraordinary interest by reason of the romantic character of the career it outlines. 'Through the Mill' has a metaphorical as well as a literal meaning. The story of a man who starts his business life with very little money, scanty education, and an unkind step-mother, — his father's opinion being 'he'll never be much use in the world' — and whose first ventures threatened to end in bankruptcy, but who at the age of eighty was the greatest miller in the world, one of the richest men in this country, and a most generous philanthropist, is unquestionably interesting. But Mr. Rank was also a Methodist and shared in the deepest and most fervent spiritual experiences to which the Methodist people testify. His benefactions were the fruit of his religion, as he himself witnessed. Today many want to know whether his religion affected the way he made his money as well as his use of it. How did he treat his employees and competitors?

The true apologetic for the faith in this age is the life it creates and here commerce is the most critical point. This biography, therefore, because of the prominence of its

subject, is vitally related to the most acute issue of our time. Mr. Burnett faces the question frankly, not by pleas and arguments, but by means of the story itself. He has been helped by some of the chief authorities in the milling trade and by a number of Mr. Rank's employees. He shows that just as we owe our national safety to the reform of our military system which swept aside the obscurantism of its leaders in consequence of the revelations of journalists, and just as something similar happened in the Church, so Mr. Rank outdistanced his competitors in trade by the recognition of the value of new methods. In addition, Joseph Rank, helped by his wife, determined, not only to live within his means and well within them, but to live sacrificially. While he gave away his money so generously, it was not by easy ways. Thomas Champness, who influenced him greatly, urged him to supervise his giving personally. This meant an enormous burden that grew with the giving. On principle he examined every appeal before responding; and he gave not only his money but himself — for example, in his work in the Sunday School. After his death a business man said: 'Well, I can't understand it. I don't mind giving away a bit of money here and there myself; but to give your *time*, and to give it to *children* — I didn't know he was like that.'

If anyone says 'All this is not enough — the world needed to be socially revolutionized', the biographer shows that in building Central Halls Joseph Rank was aware that he supported the application of Christianity to social issues, even if he did not always agree with the precise policy of the missionaries. He had a great sense of humour, as several stories in the book show, and he had no touch of snobbery. He could have had titles and a great social position, but they did not appeal to him. He was a follower of the Carpenter of Nazareth. One evening as he went to his class meeting he met an old pensioner coming away almost in tears. The usual room was being decorated and the old man could not climb the stairs to the one in which it was to be held. 'Why, is that all?' said Mr. Rank, 'We'll soon put that right. You come along with me.' When they reached the foot of the stairs he said — 'Now get on my back, I'll carry you up. I've carried many a sack of flour heavier than you.' To know him intimately, as did the writer of this review, was a great privilege. A spiritual blessing awaits all open-minded readers of this honest and beautifully written biography.

E. ALDOM FRENCH

Social Darwinism in American Thought. By Richard Hofstadter. (University of Philadelphia, via Oxford Press. 15s. 6d.)

This book will be of deep interest to two kinds of readers. Those who find a fascination in tracing the history and interplay of ideas will here discover an absorbing field. Others whose concern is the understanding of nations will here light upon an unconscious contribution to the understanding of the mind of America. The theme of the book is the influence of Darwin's evolutionary theory on science, philosophy, theology, and sociology in America since 1860. Anyone acquainted with the furor caused in Britain by the publication in 1859 of *The Origin of Species*, will scan with interest the story told here. In America, as the opening paragraph shows, the drama that unfolded had a dull beginning: 'When Darwinism first appeared upon the American scene, the country was engrossed in great political issues, and the gathering clouds of the slavery storm overshadowed intellectual interests. In June 1860, while the English reading public was agog over Huxley's clash with Wilberforce, Americans were taking the measure of the new Republican presidential candidate, and watching the Democratic split at Baltimore. Although the first American edition of *The Origin of Species* was widely reviewed in 1860, the outbreak of the Civil War eclipsed new developments in science for all but professional scientists and a few hardy intellectuals'. Yet not many years passed before the reverberations of the new evolutionary doctrine were as resounding as in Britain, and the conflict summoned protagonists

from circles of thought like those in this country. The natural scientists themselves were divided. While Asa Gray defended Darwin from the charge of atheism, Agassiz roundly proclaimed Darwinism a fad and a mania which he would outlive. By the early seventies, however, the transmutation of species and natural selection dominated the outlook of American naturalists and university teaching began to reflect the new scientific point of view. Philosophy, too, from John Fiske to William James reacted to the new doctrine, and so did historians like Henry Adams and social inquirers like Charles Loring Brace. Of Henry Adams a recent biographer writes: 'He felt, like nine men in ten, an instinctive belief in Evolution. . . . Natural Selection led back to Natural Evolution, and at last to Natural Uniformity. This was a vast stride. Unbroken Evolution under uniform conditions pleased everyone — except curates and bishops; it was the very best substitute for religion; a safe, conservative, practical, thoroughly common-law deity.' But, despite the jibe about curates and bishops, there were not wanting ministers of religion, of whom Henry Ward Beecher was a notable example, who resolutely tested and applied the new scientific doctrine to religion and theology.

The main concern of the book, however, is to test the effect of Darwinism on sociology and ethics. Here two facts call for notice. One is the quite surprising vogue of Herbert Spencer. In America his influence was certainly greater than in his own country. Yet, though nowadays we tend to smile at the man who described life as 'a continuous change from incoherent homogeneity to coherent heterogeneity', Spencer, of course, has his place in British thought, chiefly as a pioneer in using the concept of evolution as a key to the solution of philosophical, social, and moral problems. The other fact is the way in which the doctrine of evolution, with its story of the struggle for existence, as interpreted by the unbending individualism of Herbert Spencer, provided an intellectual climate in which the 'rugged individualism' of American thought could flourish and the fierce rigours of unrelenting competition in economic life could thrive. So we find W. G. Sumner, Professor of Political and Social Science at Yale, declaring that competition is the only sound economic system. When a student asked him if he wouldn't be sore if some other professor came along and took his job, he replied: 'He is welcome to try. If he gets my job, it is my fault. My business is to teach the subject so well that no one can take the job away from me.' The American intellectual climate changed, however, as the century wore on, and the emphasis passed from the individual set in a fierce competitive struggle to the social forces which were operative in shaping him. America, in fact, began to specialize in sociology. So this book ends by affirming that such biological ideas as 'the survival of the fittest', whatever their doubtful value in natural science, are utterly useless in attempting to understand society; that the life of man in society, while it is incidentally a biological fact, has characteristics which are not reducible to biology; and finally, that there is nothing in nature or a naturalistic philosophy of life which makes impossible the acceptance of moral sanctions which can be employed for the common good.

E. C. URWIN

The Training and Employment of Disabled Persons. (International Labour Office, Montreal. 6s.)

Nothing was more distressing after the last Great War than to see the great numbers of disabled soldiers who had to turn to street hawking or begging for a livelihood. This was not due merely to the general economic depression; they seemed physically unfitted for normal employment. Happily that night-marish condition of things belongs to the past. Both between the wars and at an enormously accelerated pace during the recent World War psychological medicine has made sweeping advances. While this book gives no account of the work being done by voluntary non-profit organizations

in different forms of disablement, it does show what the different countries are doing through national organizations for bringing disabled persons back into normal life and employment. Since employers fear that the disabled cannot attain the same output as the ordinary worker, a most important section of the book is concerned with an analysis of job performance. Surprisingly the results show that their work is generally better, their accident rate lower, their absenteeism less than with able-bodied workers. When statistics such as those published by U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. are better known and when the statistical evidence is wider and therefore weightier, employers ought everywhere to be enheartened when they employ the handicapped. Superficially this might seem a dull book, but behind its statements, facts, and figures there is the thrilling story of the nations' gallant attempts to overcome those disabilities which can so easily sear and cripple the mind as well as the body and unfit a man to make a new start in life.

MALDWYN EDWARDS

The Reilly Plan. By Lawrence Wolfe. (Nicholson & Watson. 6s.)

There are two permanent desires in peoples' minds which cannot easily be reconciled. One is the urge to get the maximum number of houses built in the shortest possible time, and the other the wish to build houses according to a plan that will foster neighbourhood consciousness. The obvious dangers are that, in the pressing necessity for more houses, all blitzed and otherwise vacant sites will be utilized, and that too many prefabricated temporary houses will be erected. All this, if carried to a logical extreme, would jeopardize any attempt at well-conceived planning. Now the whole drift of modern life has been away from the closely knit community with its co-operative enterprise in social and cultural activities to the large and lonely housing estates fringing the edge of towns and cities. These become 'a waste, a peopled solitude' and not a 'home for happy men'. In this book the ill effects of such isolated living in the various age groupings is graphically described. One need not approve the Reilly Plan in its entirety in order to agree with the author's contention that not only must the old invisible barriers between neighbours be broken down but the way of neighbourliness must be made easy. Yet the author overstates his case. He would claim that in the plan Sir Charles Reilly suggested for a satellite town near Birkenhead there lies a completely new and better way of life. This plan going back to the pre-Industrial Revolution housing system, would group houses around greens, with footpaths connecting the greens but no traffic road through the estate. A Reilly unit, consisting of about 1200 people and made up of three, four, or five village greens, would have its own community centre, nursery school, and twenty-four hour nursery for babies. A number of Reilly units would have an elementary school, shopping centre, a swimming pool, a communal garage, and a row of lock-up workshops. For the whole group of units there would be the administrative buildings, health and maternity clinics, library, theatre, and the civic community centre with provision for adult education. In fervent and uncritical admiration for this plan, Lawrence Wolfe claims that it gives a baby the best possible start, removes all causes of juvenile delinquency, brings young people together under the best possible conditions, and gives young married couples encouragement to have families because the burden is no longer felt, while they themselves have extended opportunities for social and cultural pursuits and loneliness and provincialism of outlook are for ever banished. To meet the needs of old age there are special types of homes, the comfort of the green, improved domestic arrangements (typical of all the Reilly kitchens), and the society of neighbours. Now a housing plan, however attractive, is like the Law. It can remove hindrances to the good life and create the right conditions for it, but more it cannot do. Lawrence Wolfe is too naively optimistic. Making no mention of spiritual provision

for the people, beyond the various cultural agencies, he assumes that a new environment and better material conditions will remove the old incentives to evil, and that the fortunate Reilly people will be healthy, happy, and wise. Village Greens will remove 'the old Adam'! This is an age-old fallacy. It asks too much from human nature, and refuses to learn from the plain lessons of history. Nevertheless, even a more modest appraisal of the Reilly Plan than the author's leaves one enthusiastic. It can be adapted to any area where there is sufficient space. Some of its details have been adopted with success in Sweden and Russia. It is more rapid of execution and less costly than any orthodox plan. Above all it provides those essential conditions without which there can be no return to a rich community life.

MALDWYN EDWARDS

Some Educational Foundations. By Donald Hughes. (Epworth Press. 4s.)

The author of this book is himself a teacher. Seeking to answer the question: 'What is a school for?' he deals first with the atmosphere or environment in which a child at school works. This should give him a 'vision of greatness' and show him the joy of creative work. In a word, it should be religious. This note runs throughout the book. In dealing with religious education in the narrower sense, the author holds that 'dogma' must necessarily be taught. In a secondary school this means, for practically all Forms below the Sixth, a presentation of the life and teaching of Christ and positive instruction about the history of the Church. The use of the ambiguous and controversial term 'dogma' in this connexion will seem inadvisable to some. In the Sixth Form Mr. Hughes holds that 'all the old battles of science and religion, determinism, materialism, the meaning of pain, and the rest' must be fought all over again, but he hardly deals with the danger that such 'battles' may become discursive and shallow 'discussion groups', instead of being devoted to the solid and constructive study of a definite subject. Teachers will be particularly interested in the chapters on 'The Day's Work' (the general reader must not imagine that such an exacting day is the lot only of the boarding school staff!), examinations (with a useful summary of arguments against the School Certificate examination), and the place of English in the curriculum. In the last the writer pleads for the English specialist. The chapter on 'The Educational Problem: Schoolmasters' is devoted mainly to protests against salary scales. Does not this give that subject a rather disproportionate place? There is, however, a valuable suggestion that the Church should hold a recruiting campaign for school teachers. The style (as one would expect from the senior English master at the Leys School) is easy and there are no dull pages. The book is a useful summary of educational values and ideals.

H. A. GUY

Women in Council. Edited by H. Pearl Adam. (Oxford Press. 5s.)

This, the Jubilee Book of the National Council of Women, will be of great value to those who wish to know something of the amazingly varied and productive work of the Council — but it has a deeper significance. It is both an account and an illustration of the Women's Movement during the last fifty years. The story of the growth in the variety of the Council's work shows the steadily widening interests of women, and their entry into every department of the nation's life. Starting as a co-ordinating body for the Conference of Women Workers, whose main interest was in the 'care of friendless girls' and kindred subjects, the Council has now sixteen committees dealing with such matters as Art and Letters, The Cinema, Education, The British Empire and Migration, Moral Welfare, Industry and Insurance, Parliament and Legislation, Women Police, Public Health and Child Welfare, and Post-War Reconstruction. There are four 'daughter' societies — The Association of Teachers of Domestic Subjects, The

National Association of Girls and Mixed Clubs, The National Women Citizens Association, and the Womens Engineering Society. The Council is also a unit in the International Council of Women. In all the fields indicated the Council has watched over women's interests, acted as a 'clearing house of information', collected and published reliable facts, and approached the Government when legislative changes were imperative. It has been magnificently led and great personalities appear and reappear in the pages of this book. The Scottish contribution has been outstanding. When the State learns to deal with women and men as equal citizens, some of the Council's work will be unnecessary, but that day is not yet. While from the first there has been a strong spiritual impulse in the Council's work, it has not escaped the secularization of the Modern World. The Christian Churches should claim and use such energy of thought and service as this book reveals.

DOROTHY H. FARRAR

A Late Lark Singing. By F. W. Boreham. (Epworth Press. 6s.)

The Master Enters. Leslie A. Newman. (Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.)

In the first of these volumes the Boreham of ripe experience still retains the radiant optimism of his long line of earlier books. Along with this there is a maturity and an even more marked depth of spiritual experience. This is as it should be, and we all may be thankful that Dr. Boreham has been spared to attain his ministerial jubilee. He is youthful still, for he retains the sense of wonder. His chapters are replete with exclamation marks! Apt illustrations besprinkle the pages; whether lovely, poignant or stirring, every one is a little gem, whilst countless allusions to characters and scenes in literature, too sympathetic to suggest mere resource to books of reference, prove that the writer has a well-stocked mind and serviceable memory. He knows, for instance, the secret of Murray McCheyne, the history of hymns and their writers, Matthew Henry's vast *Commentary* and the meaning of the 'Nightingale in Berkeley Square'. Then there is his passion for pilgrimages to Ettrick, Grasmere, or McCheyne's old church in Dundee. Here a happy comrade leads us both along old highways, pointing out new views and new lessons, and through fresh fields and byways, still wondering as we wander. If Dr. Boreham is himself 'some late lark singing' we may continue the quotation and wish for him 'the sundown splendid and serene'. May he still have many books for us.

The sub-title of the second book might well be 'Essays' (literally, if not in the literary sense) 'in Applied Pastoral Psychology', but here there are no technical terms or abstruse delineations of character; the book is a series of stories, showing how lives have been changed when the Master enters a prison or a theatre, a café or a club, a home or a 'pub'. All the incidents are fascinating. Here is a real tonic for a disheartened Christian worker, an eye-opener for a cynical non-Christian (would that all such would read it!), and, above all, a suggestive guide to all church workers, ministerial or lay, who have to deal with men and women who are 'without hope in the world'. Tact, sanctified common sense, imagination, and a profound and strong belief that lives are changed when 'the Master enters', are characteristics of the writer's anonymous friend, as to whose identity one may hazard a guess. Mr. Newman has himself adventured for the Master, and by his novel method of presenting true stories from life he has earned our further regard as a 'Master of Craft' — and Evangelism.

T. HAROLD MALLINSON

Uphill and Down. By H. L. Gee. (Epworth Press. 4s.)

Through *The Shining Highway*, *Winter's Journey*, and *War-time Pilgrimage*, a lovely trilogy, H. L. Gee has won a sure place in the esteem of a crowd of lovers of the open-air life. His new book is timely, for many people need a tonic and a diversion in these

difficult post-war days. It will be welcomed by his 'fans' (to use the terminology of the picture house), and will enlarge the circle of readers. In it Judith, a loveable figure who gives rich fragrance and colour to the stories and who is 'the power behind the throne', finding that her husband is tired and over-worked, wisely conspires to get him away for a while to pastures new for rest and change. With his knapsack on his back the traveller sets out on his journey, not knowing what experiences it will bring. Tramping the hillsides and country lanes may be good medicine, but it may also prove dull and monotonous fare — it depends on the man. H. L. Gee, with great skill, makes the journey both adventurous and gay. The traveller quickly forgets himself in the absorbing business of discovering other people on the road. This writer, as his readers know, has a gift for putting shy, repressed, lonely people at ease and drawing them out of their shell. He has a quick eye for the colours which are woven into quiet lives, by courage, humour, and rich philosophy — people who have outfaced adversity and frustration, without bitterness, are worth knowing. The wide range of personalities portrayed through contacts on the road is worth noting: some are casual contacts born of a friendly greeting; in others old friendships are renewed. Here are tiny tots, boisterous children, cripples, elderly people, charming lovers, and devoted wives and husbands. On the one hand all these are the better for meeting the friendly tramp, and on the other they enrich his life, enlarge his knowledge, and warm his heart. The book is well produced and would make an excellent gift for young or old.

WILLIAM E. CLEGG

Women of the Flag. Minnie Lindsay Carpenter. (The Salvationist Publishing and Supplies. 7s. 6d.)

The flag is blood-red but it is edged with blue. At its fiery centre is a star, inscribed with the words 'blood and fire'. That is the banner under which the women served, whose biographies are written in a really thrilling book. The recorder, Minnie Lindsay Carpenter, has already proved herself a biographer whose portrayal has colour and life, reality and sincerity.

The lives described include Mrs. Catherine Booth, the 'Mother' of the Salvation Army; Emma Booth-Tucker, the Training Home 'Mother' and subsequent missionary; Hedwig von Haartman, pioneer Officer of Finland; Yuddha Bai, typical of the missionary spirit of the Salvation Army; Alice Barker, Officer-wife and Officer-widow; Bertha Gugelmann of Switzerland, Principal of the Dutch Training Garrison; Annie Elizabeth Harris of Australia and New Zealand; Kiye Yamamuro of Japan; Martha Chippendale, worker amongst service-men; Caroline Ehrhardt, German Salvationist; Elizabeth Swift Brengle, an American whose influence spread far beyond the boundaries of physical limitations; Anna von Wattenwyl, who 'worked wonders' in Switzerland; and Elizabeth Sapsworth, the rescue-worker who did so much to develop Women's Social Work in the Salvation Army.

This is a fascinating record of a company of noble women who gave their lives to the service of Christ.

L. F. C.

Robert Louis Stevenson. By Henry J. Cowell. (Epworth Press. 4s.)

John Englishman — An Appreciation. By W. G. Hole. (Cambridge Press. 6s.)

Mr. Cowell has written an interesting book about R. L. Stevenson. It is the work of an enthusiast, who has an intimate knowledge of his subject. His book has colour and flame in it. He talks about R. L. S., his books, friends and adventures, and reveals him to his readers. While reading this book we have realized afresh how quickly R. L. S. wins his way into our affections, and claims us as his friends. He is

so sympathetically interested in our failures and triumphs, and encourages us to be happy. In this book too there are some interesting stories of Stevenson's love of missionaries and of his admiration of their work. He had hoped that he might have survived James Chalmers (Tamate), the heroic martyr missionary, in order to have been able to write his life. Stevenson even said 'Oh, Tamate, if I had met you when I was a boy and a bachelor, how different my life would have been'. It has been a delight to read this book, for Mr. Cowell is a wise writer. He does not get in the way of his hero, but reveals him and lets him talk, and the talk of R. L. S. is a constant delight. This book will quicken interest in the works of R. L. Stevenson and add to the number of his lovers.

The second book gives us a portrait in poetry of 'the Englishman's temperament and behaviour through the centuries and the last five years'. The sub-title tells us that it is 'an appreciation of the ordinary practical-minded everyday Englishman'. It is an interesting study, and shows that beneath the seeming prosaicism of the Englishman, there is to be found the strain of idealism, which 'on occasion could transform him into a hero, a martyr for conscience' sake, a reckless champion of the helpless and oppressed'. We especially welcome the poet's estimate of John Englishman's relation to the great messages of the Bible — which in days of stress 'are as an upwelling of sweet waters in a lonely place'. Mr. Hole says that at certain seasons of life poetry means much to the Englishman. He points out that, although its words 'may fade from his memory its spirit steals into his soul and, abiding there, is as the fragrance of lavender when the good wife pulls open her linen drawer'. The poem, again, is full of an understanding love of 'this dear, dear land'. It will deepen in all its readers the appreciation both of our noble traditions and great responsibilities.

W. BARDSLEY BRASH

Doom and Resurrection. By J. L. Hromadka. (S.C.M. 5s.)

All Christian preachers ought to read this book, especially any who have been lulled into a sense of security by the coming of 'peace', or who have forgotten that the spiritual world into which we were born has come to an end. The writer, a Prague Professor forced to flee to the United States, reflects the realist modern outlook; the vividness of his style reveals at once the suffering European and the profound creative thinker. Taking as a kind of text the tragic fate of Stefan Zweig, who explained his own suicide as due to the lack of 'unusual powers needed in order to make another wholly new beginning', Dr. Hromadka sets out to discuss the symptoms of the malady from which civilization is dying. Only the book's title gives a clue to his belief that new life is waiting to break through. The subject is approached through a study of three great men whose influence upon European thought has been profound. Dostoevski is taken as the first to become aware of the impending break-up of securities; but though he envisaged an unfathomable catastrophe, he laid a fresh emphasis upon man's responsibility. Again and again he showed that sin belongs, not to man's lowest nature, but to his highest, to the 'point where men make accountable decisions and defy the ultimate authority of divine truth', a thesis illustrated supremely in *Crime and Punishment*. Compassion for people must precede any understanding of spiritual problems, a compassion like the kiss of Christ that glowed in Dostoevski's Inquisitor's heart. In our own century T. G. Masaryk stood out as the Christian philosopher in his reaction against the popular idealism and Titanism of the age, and it is obvious that Dr. Hromadka owes much to his teaching, as also to Emanuel Radl, that acute critic of the widely-read publicists whose glamorous pages intensified the paganization of youth in the thirties. The third main section of the book is an interpretation of Barth, penetrating and stimulating in every sentence, though perhaps leaving the reader in some doubt as to the writer's final agreement

with the staid orthodoxy of the master's latest position. If these three men are given too little chance in the last brief chapter to display their differences, this only underlines the challenging quality of the whole book, which calls for a considered judgement from any man who reads and re-reads it. There is a final paragraph which may be taken as mere wishful thinking, but it is sober truth for men who in this shattered world still accept the sovereignty of God.

W. RUSSELL SHEARER

From My New Shelf

Does God Exist? By A. E. Taylor. (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.)

I have heard Frank Richards say that A. E. Taylor was the ablest boy at Kingswood in his time, and his time covered some forty years. In due course the boy became a very eminent Christian philosopher. This is his last book, for he died about the time when it was published. Christian philosophers have a limited scope for originality. At most they need to restate old teaching. In this book Professor Taylor set himself to show that the new discoveries in physical science do not abolish God. For the most part this means that he restates three of the old Wolffian arguments. In the main he uses one method — appealing to some human phenomenon, which the scientist must allow to be valid even though it falls outside his own realm of research, he asks whether there may not also be a God in whom it exists in a far higher fashion. For instance, the writer accepts the scientist's account of 'cause' in the physical universe, but points out that the truth that there is a uniform sequence of 'cause and effect' implies a pattern, and asks whether a universal pattern can be just a matter of chance in a realm where (biological) evolution has no place? Similarly, he points out that the scientist's own procedure always involves 'observation', and that this, in turn, implies an observer and the act of observing, and asks whether any attempt at a *complete* account of 'things' (that is a philosophy) must not include these phenomena even though physical science rightly leaves them on one side. Again, Professor Taylor restates the argument from design. He shows that men order a great part of their lives by '*prospective* contrivance', and that nature is full of this. For example, there are insects that, before their own death, lay their eggs on the leaves of the one kind of plant on which their offspring can feed — i.e. they follow a *prospective* plan. Do they foresee? This kind of phenomenon is as wide as life. Whence does it come? Under the 'moral argument', to which Professor Taylor always gave his heart, he points out that the decay of a belief in God was almost sure to be followed by the abandonment of the moral standards of the theist, as has unhappily happened in large circles today. Here he argues that the prevalent outcry against any God who allows such horrors as the recent war, bases on the assumption that God's purpose is to make men 'happy' and to do so in this life, whereas He may have an eternal purpose that is much higher than this. Do the best fathers seek nothing higher than to make their children happy? To some this seems a callous argument, and Professor Taylor has added a postscript to his book which shows that he was no unsympathetic dry-as-dust. In addition to these theistic arguments there is a chapter about the specifically Christian account of God. This, of course, centres in the Incarnation, but Professor Taylor gives his space chiefly to the Resurrection, adding comments on the Virgin Birth (considered as a *possible* way of Incarnation) and the Second Coming. He selects these three because they are so often attacked in the name of physical science. His main point here is that there are a great many particular beliefs that are accepted as part and parcel of a wider system of belief — and that a man with a different system of belief will repudiate them. (For example, yesterday, men of science firmly believed in an omnipresent ether, because this fitted into their general system of physics, but their successors repudiate it because the system has changed.) This, of course, raises the question:

'On what grounds do Christians accept their system of belief?' Professor Taylor does not explore the answer, for this lies outside the purpose of this small book, but he leaves no doubt that the words 'belief' and 'faith' are pertinent here rather than 'reason'. It is for reason to defend faith. Of course this is true of all systems whatever, for every man must take some things for granted before he can begin to reason at all. Professor Taylor believes that the Christian's faith depends upon God's 'revelation' of Himself to Christian men, however this may be more exactly defined. Here this philosopher shows that he knew how to 'become as a little child'. His book is addressed to 'the common man' — but the latter will need to ponder to understand it. While the writer's thought is clear when once understood, it is also deep. But a Christian will find it worth his while to ponder over it, for here he may learn that there is nothing in 'the science of today' that requires that he should cease to believe in God. One could wish that there were either a table of contents or an index.

The Book of Amos—Part 1, Introduction; Part 2, Translation and Notes. By Norman H. Snaith. (Epworth Press. Part 1, 2s. 6d.; Part 2, 4s.)

These two volumes, taken together, form a commentary on the Book of Amos. This Prophet, instead of being treated as just one of the so-called Minor Prophets, has long taken his place at the head of the line of Israel's greatest teachers. There is no need to say that Professor Snaith is master of all the relevant literature or that what he writes is thoroughly up to date. The *Introduction* gives a reader just what he needs to know about the historical background and Amos's message. It is also enriched by an account of the present method of treating all the Prophets — as a series of quite short passages of three different kinds. In the second volume Professor Snaith divides the Book of Amos into fifty-nine such sections, by far the largest part being 'oracles'. In these the Hebrew Prophets set a standard of what is now called 'free verse'. Professor Snaith refuses to be the slave of the method, though some may think that his divisions are too numerous. Under each section he gives us a translation, and then an exposition. Students who know no Hebrew will find this commentary especially valuable, for there is an exposition of every Hebrew phrase that requires it. Anyone who wants to begin a study of the Written Prophets will find just what he needs in these two small volumes. At the same time, Hebrew specialists will find in them the considered judgements of an expert.

Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century. By John R. H. Moorman. (Cambridge Press, 25s.)

Prejudice has both begrimed and whitewashed the Middle Ages. Now scholars are revealing the truth by the assiduous study of the surviving documents. These are voluminous for England in the thirteenth century, the hey-day of medievalism, and Mr. Moorman, mastering them all, as his forest of footnotes shows, has given us the results. It is a story of the high aims of the few and the failure of the many. Yet the failure must not be exaggerated. Apart from the concubinage of priests, there is small evidence of sensual sin, and the ordinary folk looked rather indulgently at the *focaria* or 'priest's mare', counting her a wife except in name. The great reason for failure was the love of money, which prevailed from the Pope downward. In consequence, there was profiteering at one extreme among the clergy and miserable poverty at the other. With love of money there went, of course, idleness, luxury, and waste. Next to these ignorance was the worst evil, but then a Vulgate cost about fifty pounds in our money. Mr. Moorman always points out extenuating circumstances when there are any. His book throws many very interesting 'side-lights' on the daily life both of the 'seculars' and the 'religious'. For instance, there were some twenty times as many 'secular' clergy (of various degrees) in proportion to the

population as there are today; the average stipend of a parish priest, when he had met the claims of his helpers, was about £120; it was his business to keep a bull for the village; an Archbishop bade him preach four times a year; the monks, with all their early rising, spent eight hours in bed each night; in order to pass a comfortable old age a landowner would give a piece of land to a monastery in return for a 'corrody' (board and lodging) there; many of the monks spent most of their time, not in worship, but in administering the monasteries' vast estates; monks had practically ceased to do manual work; the friars, after a brief glory — for instance, as popular open-air preachers — soon began to sink to sturdy beggars; and so on. The century comes to life in this book. It establishes the greatness of Grosseteste — yet, when he turned the Franciscans to study, their decline began. This book is history as it ought to be written.

The Political Ideas of Richard Hooker. By E. T. Davies. (S.P.C.K. 6s.)

This is a careful and competent piece of work. The theological teaching of Hooker has often been examined, particularly on the side of Church organization, but in his time religion and politics were not separated, as they came to be later, and both he and his Puritan or Presbyterian opponents assumed that the two must be taken together. At any rate they cannot be altogether separated. Of course the Presbyterians were as yet a party *within* the English Church and were seeking to adapt it to the ideas of Calvin — though it is interesting to notice that, but for the opposition of Elizabeth herself, the separatist Brownists might have been given toleration a century before the Toleration Act. In Mr. Davies' sketch of the 'Presbyterian Background', he relies chiefly on the researches of others. Perhaps one might have expected here a more explicit reference to Tyndale's *Obedience of a Christian Man*, and to the ideas current among Englishmen generally, as shown, for instance, in the *Mirror for Magistrates*. When the writer reaches his proper subject, however, he gives us his own study of Hooker's book, with copious references. The *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* opens with a discussion of the nature of law in general. Mr. Davies' exposition here is perhaps the most valuable part of his book. There was little that Hooker missed in this realm — not even the subject of international law — and his discussion is very apt to the position today — not least in his discrimination between the various meanings of the phrase 'law of nature'. His chief objection to the Presbyterian position was that it appealed exclusively to Scripture — or rather, to one particular account of the teaching of Scripture — and here he made good his claim that there are many sources of authority among men — reason and *consensus* and custom and conscience and so on, as well as Scripture. Hooker failed, however, to integrate these different kinds of authority, and it may be, as Dean Malden suggests in an introduction, that it is impossible to create a logical system here. As Mr. Davies says, there is no doubt that Hooker's own bent was toward a wise autocracy in the State, but he was too honest not to recognize that there is a place for 'the voice of the people' too. Similarly, Hooker undoubtedly believed in the Apostolical Succession, yet his argument builds upon the claim that the Bible does not lay down any fixed kind of organization for the Church of all time. This means either that he held that *some* things in the New Testament Church organization are of perpetual obligation (episcopacy, in particular), though others are not, or that he was inconsistent. Mr. Davies is unwilling to use the word 'compromise' of Hooker's theories, but there is a right kind of compromise. Most Englishmen claim that our system of government in the State is an outstanding example, and surely all plans for Christian reunion today admit that there must be compromise. The persistent difficulty is that the Churches find it very hard to agree about the nature of the right compromise. This book is a welcome supplement to other books on Hooker. His doctrine that Parliament

ought to have some share in Church government because it represents the laity of the Church, perhaps reached its term in the discussions on the Deposited Prayer Book.

The Nationalities of Europe and the Growth of National Ideologies. By H. Munro Chadwick. (Cambridge Press. 12s. 6d.)

Professor Chadwick connects nationality with language. He distinguishes it from patriotism by linking the latter with love of country. No doubt he would agree that the two often go inextricably together, but he thinks that they may be studied separately. Of course while he believes that language is the best key to nationality, he assumes that with each language there generally goes a characteristic kind of culture. A large part of his book deals with the way in which the several languages of the Continent have come to be spoken in given areas. This means that he traces the 'barbarian' invasions of Europe. In this part of his book he goes into very great detail, so that readers need to take heed lest they miss the 'wood' through looking at the 'trees'. Indeed, he leaves his readers sometimes to trace the idea of nationality for themselves amid the maze of tongues. He shows how the present language frontier in the west of Europe practically reached its present line, roughly along the Rhine, by about A.D. 600, and the Eastern frontier, approximately from the Adriatic to the Eastern Baltic, at about A.D. 1300 — that is, the languages of Europe fall, broadly speaking, into the Romance, the Teutonic, and the Slav groups. He seems to imply that during the invasions each tribe or group of tribes was sub-consciously aware of a distinct nationality, and that this survived, even though below the surface, right through the Middle Ages. Yet, though this was so, in that period the notions of nationality and political independence had no usual connexion, for the political fortune of peoples depended upon dynastic rather than racial ambitions (marriage between the members of dynasties counting for more than historians usually allow). The writer implies that the modern form of nationality includes three ideas: the bond of language, the belief that political independence should go with nationality, and the belief that government should in some way express the mind of the people itself. This modern type of nationalism first reached maturity at the French Revolution which showed itself farther East in the peoples' resistance to the attempt of Joseph the Second of Austria to impose the use of German upon the Hapsburg dominions. Of course there are exceptions to every item in all such delineations of the growth of ideologies, but no doubt Professor Chadwick would claim that the exceptions prove the rule. It is remarkable that he says so little of the emergence of national feeling in France and Spain in the fifteenth century. Perhaps he would prefer to speak of 'patriotism' here, but he connects nationality with a people's sense that it has something of its own which is worth defending and worth spreading, and surely this phenomenon occurred in the wars of France with England and of Spain with the Moors. After a brief discussion of Pan-Germanism and its parallels, he has two valuable chapters on 'The Claims to Domination' that caused the war. Here his diagnosis of the various elements in Nazi ideology is specially illuminating. To eradicate a monstrous error one needs to understand it. Professor Chadwick concludes his book with two chapters about immediate needs. The first, written during the war, now begins to be out of date. The second, urging rightly that we need to understand other peoples if we are to live in peace with them, closes with a scheme for 'an Institute of Imperial and International Studies'. It is a good sign that already the Government is moving in this direction. There are suggestive details in the book — for instance, the Soviet Union is careful to give some degree of self-government to every nationality in its realm, even to a forlorn fragment of Ossetians in the Caucasus. There is a useful map. After the welter of propaganda on the subject, it is refreshing to welcome a volume that deals so soberly with the

historical background of an idea which, for good and for evil, mightily moves the minds of all peoples today. Professor Chadwick does not so much discuss its present problems as provide materials for their discussion. He has done the necessary spade-work.

Kierkegaard's Attack upon 'Christendom', 1854-5. Translated by Walter Lowrie. (Oxford Press. 15s.)

In this volume Dr. Lowrie, the most indefatigable of Kierkegaard's translators, reaches 'almost the last' of the printed works of the Danish master. While it presupposes some knowledge of Kierkegaard's teaching, and while Dr. Lowrie refers the reader to his large book on Kierkegaard for the historical background, there are two ways in which the general reader may appraise the '*Attack*' — as a masterpiece of satire, and as a challenge to comfortable Christianity. In Germany, as Dr. Lowrie tells us in an excellent introduction, the opponents of Christianity made haste to translate it; in England, on the other hand, it is translated by 'a priest'. This is the better way for 'faithful are the wounds of a friend'. The editor has furnished a number of illustrative extracts from the master's voluminous journals. It is to be hoped that a complete translation of these will reach us in English, for to the question 'Who was the greatest Christian of the nineteenth century?' there are some who would reply: 'Not Newman nor William Booth nor Tolstoi — but Kierkegaard.'

It was part and parcel of Kierkegaard's theology that nothing merely academic was any use, and he knew that he must practice what he preached. At the end of his short life, therefore, he forced himself to wage two public crusades — one against a coarse and vulgar comic paper called *The Corsair*, in which he succeeded, at least in part; the other against Martensen and the Danish Church, in which he failed. In both crusades he had to attack people whom he knew personally — in the second, indeed, an intimate of his youth, Bishop Minster, who had just died — but 'necessity was laid upon him'. This sensitive scholar seems to have thought that the moment had come to attack 'Christendom' precisely because it was a very hard moment. He deliberately began his attack in articles in a leading secular newspaper called *The Fatherland*. When he had kindled the fire there he wrote ten numbers of a kind of magazine called *The Instant*. His death forestalled the publication of the tenth. In this volume all these are included, together with three other pamphlets. The translator, as in earlier volumes, follows the Danish as closely as English allows. Sometimes a reader all but gets lost in Kierkegaard's parentheses, but for the most part he writes as clearly as a satirist should. The Danish public waited eagerly for every issue of *The Instant*, all agog to hear 'What on earth will he say next'. But their curiosity ended with itself. They did not think of 'doing anything about it'. It seems certain that this interest-cum-indifference hastened Kierkegaard's death. In the article dated latest (though not printed last), called 'My Task', he wrote sadly that he knew that Christ meant him to be a 'sacrifice' in the cause of true Christianity — even though he himself was 'not a Christian'.

Kierkegaard was as great a satirist as Swift, but, more certainly than Swift, he was a satirist with a broken heart. He has often been compared to Pascal and these papers may be put beside the *Lettres Provinciales*. In many ways he was strangely like Jeremiah. He set himself to say extreme things. For instance, he declared again and again that there was not — indeed, could not be — a single Christian among the thousand ministers of the Established Church of Denmark. Again, universalizing Paul's teaching about marriage in the seventh chapter of 1 Corinthians, he declared (and here he had practiced his own doctrine) that a true Christian will not marry, and added that if he does, he will only bring sinners into the world and that there is no such thing as a Christian home. He claimed that a man who does not suffer —

even a man who is not persecuted — is no Christian. It is doubtful whether he meant to exaggerate, for he was a very sincere man. Rather it looks as if he fell at the end of his life under the tyranny of an *idée fixe*, for, while in this book he elucidates some New Testament passages 'to the dividing of the joints and marrow', he ignores much else in that perplexing book. After a first brief flurry of protest Martensen and the Church fell back upon the defence of silence — and won. It would be easy for a Free Churchman to find here arrows for his quiver — but equally easy for a Romanist to find arrows for his. Dr. Lowrie, indeed, thinks that if Kierkegaard had lived, he might have fled to Rome, but this is 'a hard saying'. In any case Kierkegaard would probably have felt driven to attack the Church to which he belonged. But ought we not to resist the easy way of riding off on the remark 'Interesting but extravagant', and to ask ourselves seriously the practical question: 'Can a true Christian be comfortable?' Indifference has supplanted persecution, but men's indifference to his Master broke Kierkegaard's heart.

The Russians and their Church. By Nicolas Zernov. (S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.)

Dr. Zernov follows the title of his book exactly. He tells the story, not primarily of rulers and government and war, but of the people. He loves the common folk of his country. The book, again, is not a formal history of the Russian Church — its organization, relation to the State, and so on — though a reader learns a good deal about these incidentally. The theme of the book is the perpetual unity of folk and Church through all the vicissitudes of some nine centuries. He divides his subject into three periods. The first was a period when the chief Russian power lay in what is now called the Ukraine, with its capital at Kieff. This realm was in constant contact with Europe, particularly Byzantium. If it had persisted, Russia might have grown into a European power. But in the thirteenth century there came the Tartar invasion and the attack of the Teutonic Knights. These cut off the main body of Russians from Europe and a period of isolation began. This was the formative epoch in the story of the Russian people. Moscow presently became its centre, and for religion St. Sergius, who is one of Dr. Zernov's heroes, is the chief figure even though he never preached a sermon or wrote a book! In this period Russia grew into a nation that was neither European nor Asiatic, but just 'Russian'. While owing an old debt to Byzantium, it was not just a variant of the 'Greek' Church. A certain sacramental attitude, under which the unity of life and religion is fundamental, became its permanent mark, the emphasis lying on a living ritual rather than on organization or scholarship or the revision of doctrine. It was now that the idea that Moscow was 'the Third Rome' took root, with its belief in the unity of Church and State. The third period began with the 'Time of Troubles' (political) in the sixteenth century, which coincided with the new impact of the West upon Russia. Her isolation was over. Dr. Zernov rightly gives much of his space to the last three centuries. He shows how in various ways the Czars, notably Peter the Great, took to the ways of the West, and the aristocracy and *intelligentsia* with them, while the common people, more or less instinctively, resisted. They wanted Russia still to be herself. This resistance found its outlet in the Church, and Dr. Zernov shows how the 'Great Schism' in the Russian Church was no mere quarrel about details of ritual, as it has often puzzlingly seemed to be to a Western mind. Behind these lay the question: 'Shall we copy others, or remain ourselves?' Here Dr. Zernov threads his way skilfully through a very tangled situation. For him the Marxist revolution is just the last attempt to 'westernize' Russia, and he believes that the common people, clinging to their Church, are winning the battle against its atheism.

There is much else in this very valuable book. Dr. Zernov's high calling seems to be to interpret the Russian Christian to his Western brother — a task that is urgent

indeed. In his introduction he says that no one can interpret the spirit of a society except from within it. This, of course, is true, yet there is a corresponding danger. A writer from within tends to make as little as possible of defects. Dr. Zernov, for instance, says little of the shortcomings of the Russian Church in the earlier periods, until we suddenly read that there arose a new 'type of priest' to attack the 'prevalent evils' of 'the greed and injustice of the wealthy and powerful, and the laziness and superstition of the ignorant and poor' (page 95). Similarly Dr. Zernov says but little of the long subservience of the bishops to the Tsardom. But then most Englishmen treat the failures of their own country in just this way — for instance, in Ireland. One expected some mention of Tolstoy. One may demur, too, to the statement that 'in the West, Roman Catholics and Protestants held, with equal vigour, that it was the duty of Christian Governors to execute heretics' (page 54). Is Dr. Zernov generalizing from the story of Servetus? To repress heresy is one thing, to execute heretics another. But for its purpose this book does not much fail of perfection.

Nicolas Berdyaev. By Evgueny Lampert. *Reinhold Niebuhr.* By D. R. Davies. (J. Clarke. 4s. 6d. each.)

'Existential' theology has come to stay. It is a theology of conversion. Kierkegaard seems to have been the first to use the word. For long he was neglected, but now we have existential philosophers and theologians among the Germans, the Russians, and the Americans. While they do not agree in all things, they have a common approach to 'reality' — the claim that we must take man's situation as it in fact exists. They claim that the fundamental fact is that 'God in Christ' faces man in his sinfulness and challenges him. They therefore abhor abstraction and begin with the concrete. They go on to say that all we can do with this is to examine it — to treat it dialectically. They will have nothing to do with the idea that our world is a static world. Rather, it is dynamic, and it is working up to a catastrophe which may be called 'apocalyptic'. In our present experience, again, since God faces man in it, the eternal order impinges upon the temporal. With the catastrophe time (and history) will lapse, and only eternity will remain. This doctrine, with its emphasis on sin, thrusts aside the kind of humanism that has prevailed since the Renaissance, and with it all belief in an inevitable 'progress'. At this point one of the differences among existential writers appears. Some, such as Barth, depreciate man — and with him history. Others, and among them Berdyaev and Niebuhr, insist that in 'the situation' as it exists, man has a place as well as God, and has his own part to play. Niebuhr, in particular, abandoning the old notion of 'progress', offers us something better in its place. He believes that, as one revolution follows another, that which is good in the first *may* be conserved in the second. It will be seen that such writers make much of human freedom.

These two volumes belong to the series called 'Modern Christian Revolutionaries'. They are both excellent introductions. Each of their writers sympathizes with the general position of the theologian with whom he deals, though both can criticize at times. Both have the rare gift of clear epitome, or, as Mr. Davies might say, 'bovrilization'. This does not mean that they make these two writers easy to understand at a glance — but that if the reader will take the trouble to think hard, he will see clearly where the two philosophers are going. Each book sets its subject in his social environment. Niebuhr is a reaction to Henry Ford, Berdyaev to Lenin — yet neither is a mere reaction. Both books quote at large from the writings of their subjects. Strange to say, in both books there is one rather serious misprint — 'incise' for 'excise' in Mr. Davies' volume (page 44), and 'towards' for 'against' in Mr. Lampert's (page 70). The latter, a Russian, perhaps writes better English than the former. Mr. Davies talks of 'a deeper dimension', and of 'poleaxing an attitude' and 'living a phase'! Yet

he writes as vigorously as usual. It is interesting to note that he thinks that the 'question of episcopacy and cognate issues is ultimately vital for civilization'. Will the next phase of existentialism be theistic but not Christian? There are some signs of this.

The Christian Significance of Karl Marx. By Alexander Miller. (S.C.M. 6s.)

This book set me asking questions. For instance, is it not misleading to say that Marx 'was born in Prussia in 1818?' He was born at Treves, and, while it is true that in 1818 Treves was already politically in 'Rhenish Prussia', no town was (or is) less like a Prussian town. All his life Marx was in revolt against the City of the 'Holy Coat'. Again, is it true that that complex phenomenon called 'the Renaissance' was primarily a protest against Platonic Idealism? What of Mirandola, for example? Again, Mr. Alexander holds that the so-called 'British Imperialism' of the nineteenth century grew out of an inherent defect in capitalism, but could England have flourished under *any* system (e.g. socialism) without exports? Again, is it much use to speak of 'normal men' and 'essential justice' without defining the adjectives? But, in spite of such questions, this book has value. More than half of it is an accurate but untechnical account of what Marx taught. The writer sometimes drops into the colloquial but this serves his purpose. Here is 'Marx without tears'. Similarly, the author does well to show that the Bolsheviks do not claim to be practising communism yet, but only to be preparing the way for it. He is right too in pointing out that Marx's chief achievement was in showing, with whatever exaggeration, that behind the story of many centuries there has lain a hateful 'class struggle'. Mr. Miller believes that the way to meet the Marxist challenge is to proclaim the *kerugma* of the New Testament, but perhaps here he depreciates argument overmuch. There is argument in every speech in the Acts of the Apostles, in every Epistle of Paul — and in Mr. Miller's book. In the later chapters he asks and gives his own answer to the question: 'What are Christians now to do?' Here he extends the discussion beyond his immediate subject. While he makes no attempt to give a complete answer to the question, he sets a reader thinking — and every Christian needs to think about Marxism. It is neither wholly wheat nor wholly chaff, and Mr. Miller shows his readers how to begin to use the Christian sieve.

The Teachings of Sun Yat-Sen. Compiled by N. Gangulee. (Sylvan Press. 10s. 6d.)

Professor Gangulee is an Indian who seems to know no Chinese. Perhaps, therefore, an Englishman of that ilk may review his book. As Dr. Wellington Koo sponsors the work, it may be taken for granted that it does accurately present Sun Yat-Sen's teaching. The book is a selection from Sun's speeches, letters, etc. They are all as clear as Stalin's. There is much repetition, for Sun knew that one must hit a nail on the head more than once to drive it home. Lapses from English idiom are very few, but the book is not without misprints. Professor Gangulee provides a good biographical background. The key to Sun's teaching is 'modernization, not Westernization'. Yet, even though his references to the Western Powers are usually critical, Sun admits that his country will need the help of Western capital in the future and most of his ideas are borrowed from the West. He believes, of course, in democracy, in one of the senses of the word, and he quotes Lincoln's famous three-fold saying about 'the people' several times. Yet he is able to quote Mencius in support of the doctrine '*vox populi, vox Dei*', in which he believes, though where we say 'God' he says 'Heaven'. Yet he believes too that popular opinion needs to be educated. Here he has borrowed from Russia, holding that there must first be a 'Party' that seizes power, that then it must educate the masses, and that only when this education has gone a good, long way are the people to be trusted with self-government. But what when two 'Parties'

both believe that they are the Heaven-sent educators? There are other distinctive marks of Sun's type of 'democracy'. For instance, he believes that a national government should work through five councils — executive, legislative, judicial, 'examination', 'control'. Here, of course, he is enlarging Montesquieu's three-fold division of the functions of government which the United States adopted. The 'examination' department is to educate experts in government, and here there is age-long Chinese precedent. So, though less adequately, there is precedent for the 'control' department, which is to see that the other four do their duty. Another peculiarity lies in the four-fold power given to the electorate. It is not only to exercise the rights of election, initiative, and referendum, as in Switzerland, but also the right to 'recall' unsatisfactory representatives. Again, an 'international' body is to supply foreign capital, and there is an ingenious suggestion about the land tax — the owner is to be left to assess its value himself, but the government is then to decide whether it will tax or buy his land. No one can doubt Sun's courage as he faced the problems of four hundred million people. For instance, he held that it would be easy to make a million miles of road. Yet he has been canonized in China as Lenin in Russia, and with that parallel who can dismiss him as a dreamer?

BOOKLETS AND PAMPHLETS

It is well that Karl Barth's *The Germans and Ourselves* has been 'Englished' (Nisbet, 2s. 6d.). In it the great Swiss preaches to Christian Swiss — and to all Christians. His theme is 'Forgiveness'. For him, as for Jesus, this is no easy and sentimental business, but a difficult duty of love. There is here no mitigation of German guilt, for true forgiveness tells the hard truth. On the other hand, Barth warns against Pharisaic preaching. While the Christian who forgives will hide none of the stern truth, he will yet look for any small sign of good as he learns more about the German people and will lay hold of it. Even where there is no such sign he knows that he who loves his neighbour will set himself patiently to help him to 'start from zero'. Near the end of this booklet Barth sets a thoughtful German to arraign the conduct of the Swiss at the various stages of the war. Confessing that a Swiss has no adequate answer, he shows that it is for a Christian to help even when he is not worthy to do so. In this brief pamphlet he gives the indubitable Christian answer to the question: 'What are we to do about the Germans now?' . . . To draw a line from France to China is to begin to get some idea of the scope of the work of the Friends' Ambulance Unit. In it seven hundred young Christians have set themselves to relieve the havoc of war. They enjoy a little pocket-money besides their 'keep'. *The Sixth Report* (4 Gordon Square, W.C.1) is now issued. Once upon a time 'reports' were dry-as-dust, but the Friends, like others, know now how to 'make dry bones live'. All should help the Unit for the Unit helps all. . . . In *The Religion of the Jew*, by Basil Henriques and Alfred Marmorstein (Newman Wolsey, Leicester, 6d.), two Jews, the one Progressive and the other Orthodox, give short and serviceable statements of the faith that is in them. They differ, of course, about the obligatoriness of the ritual Law. Neither 'speaks to the condition' of a third Jew who cried: 'Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' . . . In *Cameis and Grumblers* (Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.) Mr. Derrick Cuthbert has collected twenty of his 'Little Talks to Children'. They are brief — not more than two pages long. They are bright, for the author knows which pebble to pick up as he walks the beach. They are to the point — for he knows the ways of small folk. In short, if anyone wants to steal children's addresses . . . ! . . . Bishop Gore could discuss erudite theology with any man. He could also 'speak to the condition' of the man-in-the-pew. He does this in *Prayer and the Lord's Prayer* (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d.). It is a reprint of articles written fifty years ago — yet here there is nothing out of date. For instance, the first chapter is on 'The Efficacy of Prayer'. . . . 'Sufferer' is a Christian

who flew in the first World War and has been an invalid for ten years. He is well fitted, therefore, to write a book of devotion. He knows too where to look for apt quotations and illustrations. He gives us ten quiet talks in *The Broken Nest* (Epworth Press, 2s.). There are beautiful pictures to match them. The first quotation gives the key to this small casket — 'When your heart is breaking God knows your address'. . . . 'We are living in Biblical times', says Canon Roger Lloyd in 'The Bishop of London's Lent Book'. His title is *The Glorious Liberty* (Longmans, Green, 2s. 6d.), and he explores the subject with the Old Testament in his hand as well as the New. Happily it is always Lent for such a book. Here are *Deuteronomy* and *Babbitt*, Paul and Maritain, rightly cheek by jowl. . . . The Epworth Press sends us two religious plays this quarter. When I took up the first, *Himself Once Offered, a Drama of the Divine Passion* (9d.), I turned at once to the scene called 'Calvary'. It is just right — the words of Scripture, quiet music, three very brief meditations, two of them from a poem of the sixteenth century. The other two scenes are headed 'What is truth?' and 'Woman, why weepst thou?' No one need hesitate to use this Passion Play of Leonard Verrier's. The other play is for Harvest Festivals — *The Most Important Things*, by P. Addison Devis (6d.). In it Mary and Alice talk with characters called 'Water' and 'Flour' and 'Oil' and so on, and there are songs interspersed. There is nothing stilted about it — for instance, Milk says: 'Please ask somebody to write a hymn about me'. . . . There is a constant demand for a booklet to give to those who are just joining the Church. The Church of Scotland Youth Committee (181 George Street, Edinburgh) provides one in *The Enterprise of Faith* (1s.), by Innes Logan. It is as thorough a piece of work as we expect from a Presbyterian source — and none the worse for a few quotations from the Shorter Catechism. . . . What about the men in the Forces now? In a booklet named *The Unspeakable Gift*, by Simeon E. Cole (Epworth Press, 6d.), we have an address given at a Carol Service in a Concentration Camp, on a subject as perennial as Christmas, and in *Demobilization Crusade*, by Frank N. Inger (Epworth Press, 6d.), a very practical account of the way to welcome the lads to 'Blighty'. . . . *Christianity and the World of Nations*, by George F. MacLeod, of the Iona Community (Friends House, 4d.), is a broadcast on Forgiveness and its Cost — to Christ and to us. It is just alive with the Gospel. . . . The War and the Peace have both thrust upon us the reconsideration of the old Christian doctrine of 'The Law of Nature'. A. R. Vidler and W. A. Whitehouse, who have edited *Natural Law* (S.C.M., 2s.) for a group of scholars from various Churches, name thirty-nine recent works in their bibliography! Most of these are outstanding works, but few of them deal with the Law of Nature *simpliciter*. A small but reliable book introducing the subject was sorely needed. Here it is! It asks rather than answers the questions of today, but this just shows where we are, and it asks the right kind of question. . . . In *The British Army* (Gramol Publications, 7s. 6d.) Lt.-Col. Seton Hutchinson, to quote Field-Marshal Montgomery's foreword, 'places before the youth of this country the brave deeds of the British Army', both in the past and the present. As there is to be an Army, it is perhaps as well that there should be Christians in it, and surely even pacifists ought to know something about it. . . . In *The Case for Poland* (Ann Arbor Press, Michigan, 25 cents), Miss Ann Su Cardwell, an American who 'has spent much of her adult life studying the situation on the spot', sets out the facts that make up the Polish 'case' against Russia. Of course there is something to be said on the other side, but Poland's case needed to be put and put clearly. When will someone state the still stronger case for Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania?

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

- The Yale Review*, Winter Number (Yale University, via Oxford Press, \$1.)
 America and Britain. By D. W. Brogan.
 Strikes and the Public Interest. By Sumner H. Slichter.
 James and Conrad. By E. K. Brown.
 The Physiology of Alcohol. By Howard W. Haggard.
- The Expository Times*, January. (T. & T. Clark, 1s.)
 Reconciliation and Reality: The Revolt of German Youth. By Konrad Braun.
 The Instability of Theism: III. By David S. Cairns.
 Preaching the Gospel and the Propaganda of the Christian Social Movement. By G. Clive Binyon.
- ditto*, February.
 Reconciliation Between the Generations: I. By W. Fraser Mitchell.
 The New Age. By J. Glyn Thomas.
 Miracle. By P. L. Allen.
- ditto*, March.
 'The Church which is His Body'. By W. A. Lofthouse.
 The New Order — The Church, Catholic and Evangelical. By John Gray.
 The Interpretation of the Old Testament. By James Wood.
- The Journal of Religion*, October. (University of Chicago, via Cambridge Press, \$1.25.)
 The Reviving Theology of the Old Testament. By William A. Irwin.
 The Theology of Luther in Swedish Research. By Edgar M. Carlson.
 The Letters of Rosenzweig and Rosenstock-Huussy. By Dorothy M. Emmet.
- The Hibbert Journal*, January. (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d.)
 Sin and Herd Instinct. By Laurence Housman.
 An Anchor for the Soul: T. S. Eliot's Later Verse. By R. H. Coats.
 Matthew Arnold and the Modern Church. By H. S. Shelton.
 The Significance of Søren Kierkegaard. By F. McEachran.
 Man into Wolf. By Robert Eisler.
- The International Review of Missions*, January. (Oxford Press. 3s.)
 Year of Grace, 1945: Survey. By N. Goodall and M. Sinclair.
 The Indigenous Medical Evangelist in Congo. By Stanley G. Browne.
 An Institute for Pastors and Evangelists in Guatemala. By Harry Peters.
 Far Eastern Future. By Kenneth S. Latourette.
- The Moslem World*, January. (Hartford Seminary, via Marshall, Morgan & Scott. 2s.)
 The Church in Iran. By J. Mark Irwin.
 The Sanusis. By Charles C. Adams.
 Mohammedan Art in Spain. By Bessie H. Weber.
 Changes in Arabia. By Cornelia Dalenberg.
 Islamic Studies in U.S.S.R. and Turkey. By Richard N. Frye.
- The Presbyterian*, November. (J. Clarke. 1s.)
 John Wesley's 'Toryism' and our Present Discontents. By E. Gordon Rupp.
 'In hoc Signo Vincas' (The Cross Today). By T. F. Torrance.
 St. John of the Cross as a Reformed Theologian. By H. Cunliffe Jones.
 The Apocalypse of Ishmael (Moby Dick). By M. and A. N. Prior.
- Religion in Life*, Winter Number. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via Epworth Press. 6s. 6d. per annum.)
 The Immortality of Man. By William E. Hocking.
 Francis Asbury. By Francis J. McConnell.

Form Criticism and Faith. By Paul S. Minear.

The Roman Catholic Church in Europe. By Adolph Keller.

Interpreting the Time. By Amos N. Wilder.

The Church and Social Action. By Ansley C. Moore.

The Hidden Church and the Churches in Sight. By H. Richard Niebuhr.

Wanted: The Recovery of the Christian *Paideia*. By E. G. Homrighausen.

Studies in Philology, October. (University of North Carolina Press, via Cambridge University Press. \$1.50.)

Studies in the Perlesvaus. By Helen Adolf.

Buzones, an Alternative Etymology. By D. W. Robertson.

Conjectures regarding Chaucer's Manuscript of the Teseida. By Robert A. Pratt.

Encore un Mot sur l'Italien Carapignarsi. By Raphael Levy.

Akenside and Imagination. By A. O. Aldrige.

Landor and the 'Satanic School'. By R. H. Super.

Dickens' Influence as an Editor. By Gerald G. Grubb.

More Reade Notebooks. By Wayne Burns.

A LIBERAL HISTORIAN: CHARLES BEARD

OVER half a century has gone by since Charles Beard died on 9th April 1888, yet his name is still more than worthy of recall. He is remembered chiefly for a notable series of *Hibbert Lectures* on the Reformation, which he delivered in 1883 and which, upon their republication in 1927, received high praise from Professor Ernest Barker. Specialists are acquainted with his two-volumed history of the Port Royal Controversy and with a posthumous publication on Martin Luther, the first instalment in a series of reformation studies never completed. But Beard is worthy of a closer attention than that of a passing tribute to learned historical research all the more remarkable because restricted of necessity to the printed page. He represents a high type among liberal interpreters of history; he is, therefore, an example of a definite philosophical approach to the general meaning of the human story. His liberalism may be under a cloud at the present time, yet it must be considered whether it does not represent a valuation which might be brought back in some degree with considerable profit to contemporary life.

The son of a distinguished Unitarian minister, Dr. J. R. Beard, Charles Beard was born in Manchester in 1827. Educated at a school kept by his father and at Manchester New College, still situate at that date in Manchester itself, he graduated B.A. of London University in 1847, taking high honours in the class-lists. The many-sided abilities of Charles Beard have been well summarized by Dr. L. P. Jacks, the successor to his Liverpool ministry: 'Next to James Martineau, Beard was the most conspicuous figure in the Unitarianism of that day, a man in whom idealism and realism were well mingled, eminent both as a scholar and as a divine, a powerful orator in the pulpit and on the platform. In the Church of England he would have become a bishop, in politics a cabinet minister, in journalism editor of *The Times*'.¹

In many ways, Beard represents the passage to modernity more clearly than did Martineau. He had been brought up in the older scriptural Unitarianism with its lingering relics of eighteenth-century Arianism. His father was promi-

¹ L. P. Jacks: *From Authority to Freedom*, p. 280.

ment among the theologians of this school; to him, miracle connoted actual happening and Scriptural inspiration a fact which marked off the Bible from every other book'.¹ Dr. J. R. Beard was a theological Unitarian whose life was spent in spreading his principles both through incessant writing and through founding congregations to voice them. His son was deeply influenced by wider views of religion and philosophy. He remained passionately Christian but his attitude toward the historic Jesus was of a more rationalistic and critical cast. He had rejected miracle and any unique inspiration inherent in the Biblical literature, though his mysticism saved him from the positivism which engulfed so many Liberals of that generation. His thought centred in the idea of a universal incarnation of God, imperfectly manifested in all men and perfectly exhibited in Jesus Christ. He pleads this view in his contribution to a series of Unitarian lectures delivered in 1881 by various ministers and prefaced by Martineau himself, *Positive Aspects of Unitarian Christianity*. It is also found in a volume of sermons, *The Universal Christ*, issued after his death. He 'looked upon Christ as the most signal manifestation of that infusion with the Divine, which is a universal fact, and found in him the typical example of the method and final example of human goodness'. 'I do not ask what untrodden heights of holiness still towered above the Jesus whom I love: I do not anticipate a Christ that is to be, in whose glories the Christ to whom so many ages have looked up shall be hidden. When new religions ask my allegiance, or philosophy assures me that in the light of fresh knowledge it is time to have done with religion, I am content to say with Peter, "Lord, to whom shall I go? Thou hast the words of eternal life"'.²

In the teaching of Charles Beard is to be found a strong emphasis upon the essential liberal principles of toleration and rationality. His approach to religion was grounded upon a mysticism transmitted through reason; he believed in the moral supremacy of the human Jesus because it appealed to him as a belief intrinsically reasonable when tested by intellectual evidence. At the same time, he insisted upon the practical virtues of liberality, toleration, and freedom of thought. Liberalism was a creed which had its modern origins in the sixteenth century; it represents the new sense of individualism, freedom, and progress, which that period achieved. Beard was peculiarly fitted to become its historian; he had a thorough grasp of the causes of the Reformation revolt whilst he had an understanding of the meaning of liberalism, political and theological, as it had since become, gained from his years as a minister and a citizen.

The most enduring work of Beard is to be found in his *Hibbert Lectures*. They formed an entirely new approach in English scholarship to the upheavals of the sixteenth century; much subsequent work is a development of their point of view. He commences by outlining the various reform movements before the Reformation, discusses the Reformation itself, and ends with an appeal that its work should still be continued. It is a conception of the upheavals of the sixteenth century as a general continuous movement rather than as an event, and its influences persist to the present time. 'So age follows age, and each pours fresh wealth into the treasury of human knowledge—as men accumulate

¹ cf. the sketches of father and son in H. McLachlan: *Records of a Family*.

² Quotations from Lecture in *Positive Aspects of Unitarian Christianity*.

a riper experience, solving ever more perfectly the problems of life and entering upon wider possibilities.¹ The New Testament is the commencement of a lengthy Christian experience; the history of the Church is not one of an unfolding of developments in doctrine, as Cardinal Newman urged, but of a steady growth in spiritual knowledge. The Reformation movement was one based upon principles of freedom and progress; these principles had not been finally established at any one point, whether it be the evolution of the latter-day Church of England or the ejection of the Puritans in 1662. It is necessary that the spirit of the Reformation should be regarded as an attitude of faith enshrined in a movement whose actual beliefs change from age to age. The growth of the critical spirit and of scientific investigation has not ceased; the general movement which commenced with the anti-Papal legislation of Henry the Eighth still goes on. Beard is notable in that he was one of the first English religious historians to envisage Protestantism as being more than a religion tied down by the letter of the New Testament; his approach to dogma was that of reason. 'Whatever theologians, even of the extreme Catholic type, may say, the application of reason to religion lies in the nature of things: the only question is as to the method and the degree. The vast folios of the Fathers, the elaborate disquisitions of the Schoolmen, the massive and minute systems of the Protestant dogmatists, are all essentially rationalistic.' Yet he refused to carry reason beyond its acknowledged limits: 'It matters little whether reason be critical or only expository: there are some things which are too great for it, and confound it.'² Together with Dr. P. H. Wicksteed, Beard contended for a view of religion which, though expressed through reason, yet rested upon the ultimate truth of a mystical sense of Final Reality as Self, Boundless, Fathomless, Unknowable, standing beyond the borders of individual selves. 'The rationalists still have to go to the mystics if they would learn the whole secret of Christianity.' It was a sympathy with mysticism which promoted Beard's interest in Port Royal and the Jansenists.

The *Hibbert Lectures* were at once received as an outstanding contribution to historical knowledge set out in the broadest terms. Mr. Gladstone recognized their candour and their freedom from sectarian limitations. Writing to Beard to acknowledge a presentation volume, he said: 'All systems have their *slang*, but what I find in almost every page of your book is that you have none.'³ Professor Ernest Barker has ranked the volume with Maine's *Ancient Law* and Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire* as among the epoch-making influences upon his own life. The book is one of the best introductions to the period in the English language: 'Beard's *Hibbert Lectures*, though nearly thirty years old, still afford the best survey of the general character and abiding influence of the Reformation.'⁴ Praised by Lord Acton, the lectures afford a model of liberal writing, inspired by a vital desire for freedom and progress as a moral attitude existing within an atmosphere of reason and tolerance. Beard was able to exhibit the sixteenth century as the potent source for the spirit and movements of his own day. During the last twenty years since 1919, these ideals have declined; liberalism as Beard knew it is under a cloud. It is important, therefore, to analyse the causes which have led to the waning of the historical point of view

¹ C. Beard: *op. cit.*, p. 430.

² Beard: *op. cit.*, p. 380.

³ Morley: *Life of Gladstone*, II, 544.

⁴ G. P. Gooch: *History and Historians of the Nineteenth Century*.

which he portrayed, causes which have not a little to do with present crises within the human spirit.

The incidental blemishes upon Beard's book are few. He underrated the importance of the burning of Servetus by Calvin, as Alexander Gordon illustrated, and he showed a strange want of sympathy with certain manifestations of the Broad Church movement of his own day within the Church of England. Yet, unlike J. J. Tayler in his well-known *Religious Life of England*, he did set the Reformation movement into its whole historical context and view it as the evolution of history rather than as the chiselling out of certain dogmatic forms. In spite of this realization, however, Beard and his generation were too greatly influenced by the attitude typified in Thomas Carlyle with his 'the great man' theory of history. There is little reference in his writings to history as created by ethical or economic motives which themselves provide leadership. The Marxist analysis of historical causes still lay in the future so far as historians were concerned; the fact that Professor Thorold Rogers had reached certain Marxist results independently of Marx's own work had yet to be recognized in its full importance. Beard understood the religious meaning of history, he had a deep sense of the qualities of the strong leader as shaping the times, but he was decidedly defective when economic and commercial interpretations came to be discussed as causations within history. The individualism of the older liberalism refused to see historical motives as a movement independent to some measure of individuals; Beard's writings suffer from these limitations. After 1919, the pressure of events compelled a reassessment.

There is also a defect upon the side of the myth summing up human ideals and aspirations which Beard sought to set forth. Its content was summarized by reason, liberality, progress; he was essentially a Hebraist with slight regard for Hellenic interpretations of life; his appeal was to Carlyle rather than to Goethe. He came of Puritan stock; the legacy of the Divine *agape* led him to overlook the importance within human motives of *eros*. Since 1919, the content of the old liberal mythology has been questioned very generally. A new irrationalism has attacked the worth of human reason, power-politics have weakened the appeal to toleration, it is not necessary to go as far as did Dean Inge in a famous lecture to feel intensely sceptical concerning the old liberal view of progress as a factor inevitably beneficent for the human race. Periods of much forward endeavour may be followed by others of vast moral retrogression. Beard came from a time when progress seemed to be set forth in the general prosperity of the world around; he could not know the unhappy sequel which was to overtake the next generation. His faith in education, in the inevitability of gradualness, in a sense that 'time is on our side', needed relating to a broader social and economic background if it was not to prove a delusive disappointment. It was this relationship which the older liberals failed to work out in its detailed applications; they needed a fuller doctrine of community than they possessed.

But, in view of recent world-happenings, it may be claimed that the liberal philosophy of history, as Charles Beard proclaimed it, does represent a stage of thought from which much may still be learned. Beard urged the rights of human reason; he stood in antagonism to the irrationality which has since reappeared under such forms as Barthianism. He claimed that no doctrinal

system could comprehend Ultimate Truth; he was therefore an opponent of the credalism of the neo-Medievalism which has appeared again within theology. His stress upon tolerance was in antagonism to the slight regard paid in the modern world to ideals of civil and religious liberty. In the last resort, his political principles were shaped by his times and yet embodied considerable vision of a constant moral attitude. To Beard, the same remark might be applied as was made concerning another liberal thinker, Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson: 'But politics, as he understood them, are not based upon party. They represent the attempt of Man to adapt himself to his environment and to control his future.'¹ For Beard, the future to be desired was to be controlled in terms of progress and education; because he saw the Liberal Party fighting for these things when their reactionary opponents sought to belittle them, he was a consistent and militant political liberal.

When addressing the students of Manchester New College at the close of the session of 1884, he said: 'You are not to go forth to devote yourselves to the exclusive service of any single Church or sect. You will have specific duties to perform, a definite corner of the vineyard of Christ given you to cultivate, and to it you must give your whole powers. But rightly looked at, this self-consecration does not hinder, but absolutely demands for its own perfection that larger allegiance to truth which always looks for fresh light to break out of every word of God, that broader loyalty to Christ which cannot be satisfied with less than the Communion of Saints.' Even if the specific philosophy which Beard proclaimed needs contemporary readjustment, its ethical orientation still proclaims a broad attitude denoting a high sense of right combined with a desire for human freedom of the mind from all dogmatisms. The conclusions of his *Hibbert Lectures* do not need to be contradicted today, whether in Church or in State, but to be presented anew in a dress adapted to the twentieth century and its problems. Reactions from his position have become too extreme in their implications; as Dr. H. G. Wood remarked in his *Hulsean Lectures* (a book which would have cheered Charles Beard), the denial of 'the great man' theory of history has gone quite far enough. Christianity has always retained in theory a dual stress upon man as an individual of eternal worth and as a being living in social relationship to his fellow-believers. The denial of this view by irrationalism of the inter-war years has produced in politics the Dead Sea fruit of dogmatic aggression and in theology the narrowness of the doctrinal cultus. No greater service could be rendered to the memory of so typical an older liberal as Charles Beard than that his principles should be set in a new relationship embodying their constant non-dogmatic and moral attitude. In some ways, he needed modifying in himself; his spirit was shaped by Amos and Isaiah; it required the balancing Hellenic influence of Plato and of Goethe. But it would be difficult to find a more typical liberal of high ethical tone who, whatever his limitations of theory, presents the world of today with the challenge of the only attitude toward history and toward the future upon which an international sense of commonwealth may be built up.²

F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT

¹ E. M. Forster: *Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson*, p. 114.

² No full-length biography of Charles Beard has ever been written. Reference may be made to *The Dictionary of National Biography* (art. by Alx. Gordon); McLachlan: *Records of A Family*; and (for the Liverpool period) the story of his old congregation, Anne Holt: *Walking Together*.

of
ain
aid
rt,
ole
be
ves
ty.
nd
ed
ng
he

he
he
to
nd
a-
er
rd
es
rd
o-
re
is
in
nd
ir
ok
ry
in
a
is
ad
al
un
w
e.
os
e.
o,
l-
ch

to
ed